



Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-119
Tuesday
21 June 1988

Daily Report Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-119

CONTENTS

21 June 1988

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

'Experts' Visit Nevada Nuclear Test Range	1
Mikhaylov Interviewed [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Jun]	1
Accreditation Ceremony Held	3
2 Nuclear Explosions Planned	3
Golts Views 9th Anniversary of SALT II Treaty [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Jun]	3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

'International Situation' on Military, PRC [Patsyuk, Bogachev, Filatov, Adrianov]	5
'Observers Roundtable' on U.S. 'Hegemonist' Ideas [Agayants, Andrianov, Kornilov]	8
'International Review' on F-16's, Afghanistan [Zafesov in PRAVDA 19 Jun]	13
Rogachev on Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation [IZVESTIYA 15 Jun]	15
Loginov on Arms, Regional Issues, Conference [Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU 9 Jun]	17
Demichev Attends Nuclear-Free Zones Meeting	21
Seen Off by Talyzin	21
Arrives in Berlin	21
Addresses Meeting	21
Gorbachev Greets Forum [PRAVDA 20 Jun]	21
Gerasimov Holds Foreign Ministry Briefing 17 Jun	22
Cites Pakistani Violations	22
Shultz Adviser Criticized [IZVESTIYA 19 Jun]	22
Condemns Writer on Palestinians [Kuwait KUNA]	23
Hails Vietnamese Withdrawal	23
Backs Polish Arms Initiative	23
Further on Gerasimov 13 Jun News Briefing [ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 25]	23
Foreign Leaders Briefed by Special Envoys [PRAVDA 18 Jun]	24
CSCE Delegation Holds Vienna News Conference	25
Petrovskiy Holds News Conference at UN 17 Jun [PRAVDA 18 Jun]	25
Linnik Praises Outcome of UN Disarmament Debate	25
Vorontsov Receives World Muslim Congress Head	26

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Former CIA Employee Edward Howard Interviewed	27
Ponomarev Assesses Value of Moscow Summit [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Jun]	31
Lobachenko Views Pentagon Procurement Scandal	32
UK Paper on U.S.-Iran 'Secret Proximity Talks'	33
Veterans Demand U.S. Extradite Alleged Criminal [IZVESTIYA 18 Jun]	33
Stavropol Signs Contact Agreement With Iowa	34

China

Special Envoy Tian Zengpei in Moscow for Talks	34
Meets With Rogachev	34
Received by Shevardnadze	34
Departs for Beijing 21 Jun	35

Near East & South Asia

Afghan Rebel Government in Exile Assessed	35
Mas'ud Leads 'Administration'	35
Hikmatyar Role Viewed [Malikov]	36
Afghan Chief of Staff Views Army's Prospects [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Jun]	36
'Political Prisoners' in Afghanistan Profiled [MOSCOW NEWS No 23]	37
Afghan Officials Cite Pakistani Violations	38
Withdrawal From Paktia Province Detailed [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 15 Jun]	39
Pakistan Sending 'Terrorists' Into Afghanistan	40
Pakistan Envoy Questioned on Soviet MIA's	41
Apparent Fate of MIA in Afghanistan Described [Olynik in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Jun]	41
Prospects for Mideast Settlement Assessed [Geyvandov in IZVESTIYA 19 Jun]	44
Petrovskiy Discusses Mideast Conference, Gulf [Abu Dhabi AL-ITTIHAD AL-USBU'I 16 Jun]	45
Primakov Views Current Mideast, Gulf Issues [London AL-HAWADITH 17 Jun]	49
Akhromeyev Holds 'Friendly Talks' With Algerian [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Jun]	51
Israeli 'Terrorism' as 'State Policy' Condemned [Babenko]	51

East Europe

Journalist Views Impact of Polish Strikes [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 Jun]	52
IZVESTIYA Reports PZPR Plenum on Reform [17 Jun]	53
Biryukova Receives CSSR Party Official [PRAVDA 18 Jun]	54
PRAVDA Reports CPCZ Presidium Session [11 Jun]	54
Shishlin Writes on MSZMP Conference Results [Budapest NEPSZABADSAG 11 Jun]	54

West Europe

Kamentsev, Finnish Minister at Plant Founding [PRAVDA 15 Jun]	55
French Socialist Justifies Nuclear Deterrent [IZVESTIYA 15 Jun]	55
MOSCOW NEWS Begins Publication in Britain [IZVESTIYA 14 Jun]	56
Briefs	56
Belgian Delegation Visits	56
Italian Agricultural Cooperation	56
Parliamentarians Visit	56

Latin America & Caribbean

Nicaragua's Ortega Cited on Economic Measures	56
Official on Situation in Northern Nicaragua	57
Lomeyko Briefs Mexican Government on Summit	57

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Further Reportage on Armenia, Azerbaijan Dispute	58
Tatliyev Addresses Azerbaijan Presidium [Baku]	58
'Unusual' Calm in Yerevan [Yerevan]	58
'Thousands' Gather in Stepanakert [AFP]	59
Azerbaijan's Deputy Procurator Interviewed [Baku]	59
Voronin Meets Vezirov, Elected Delegate [Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 4 Jun]	61
Afanysev on Yeltsin Remarks, Nagorno-Karabakh [Barcelona LA VANGUARDIA 3 Jun]	61
Gromyko, Pimen Address Orthodox Church Guests	63
Gromyko Answers Questions [PRAVDA 12 Jun]	63
Pimen Addresses Group	69
Metropolitan Filaret on Church-State Relations [Hamburg DER SPIEGEL 20 Jun]	71
Demichev Presents Awards to Orthodox Clergy [PRAVDA 11 Jun]	73
Shcherbitskiy Speaks on Restructuring [IZVESTIYA 11 Jun]	74
Kiev Public Debates Restructuring Issues [SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 7 Jun]	78
Tajik Supreme Soviet Personnel Changes Noted [Dushanbe]	81

'Mass Binge' Leaves 10 Dead, 80 Hospitalized	81
'Dogmatism' Seen as Root of Political Ills [IZVESTIYA 10 Jun]	81
TV Debates Show 'Pluralism of Opinions' [SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 14 Jun]	86
Letter Criticizes Proposals on Leaders' Tenure [SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 18 Jun]	86
Necessity of 'Cleansing' Party Discussed [Stepanov]	86
Reader Warns of Dangers of Party Autocracy [PRAVDA 20 Jun]	87
Self-Criticism From General Secretary Urged [IZVESTIYA 18 Jun]	87

Agricultural

Early Jun Weather, Crop Condition Reported [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 15 Jun]	88
Regions Should Be Able To Supply Own Food [PRAVDA 14 Jun]	89

Scientific

Reportage on 'Mir' Cosmonauts, Space Experiments	90
Cosmonauts Receive Awards	90
New Crystals, Compounds Noted	91
Bogodyazh on Cosmonauts	91
Supernova Observations Cited	91
More on Experiments	91
Research Vessel Concludes Antarctic Voyage	92
Vorotnikov Presents RSFSR Science Prizes	92
Leaders Sign Academician Naumov's Obituary [PRAVDA 15 Jun]	92
Briefs	93
New Tadzhik Academy President [Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA 7 May]	93

'Experts' Visit Nevada Nuclear Test Range

Mikhaylov Interviewed

PM2006133088 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 18 Jun 88 First Edition p 5

[Interview with Doctor of Physico-Mathematical Sciences Viktor Nikitovich Mikhaylov, leader of group of Soviet experts traveling to Nevada test range, by unnamed TASS correspondent: "Joint Experiment"; date and place of interview not given—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] A special flight by the "Ruslan," the world's biggest aircraft, on 14 June delivered to the United States the Soviet equipment for measuring the yield of nuclear explosions that will be used in the joint verification experiment at the nuclear test range in Nevada. In a few days, a large group of Soviet experts will set off for Nevada to take part in the preparations and conduct of the joint experiment. In this connection, Doctor of Physico-Mathematical Sciences Viktor Nikitovich Mikhaylov, leader of the group, answered a TASS correspondent's questions.

[Correspondent] What is the joint verification experiment, and why is it being carried out?

[Mikhaylov] The holding of the joint verification experiment is an integral part of the full-scale Soviet-American talks on the problem of nuclear tests, talks which it was agreed to hold in September of last year. As a first step at the talks, the USSR and the United States are to agree on improved measures for the verification of the so-called "threshold" treaties—the 1974 Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests and the 1976 Treaty on Underground Nuclear Tests for Peaceful Purposes. The mandate for the talks also envisages that the sides will agree on further interim limitations on nuclear tests on the way to the final goal—a complete end to them.

I would like to remind you that the aforementioned treaties, which set a permitted threshold of 150 kilotons on the yield of nuclear explosions, did not come into force, because the American Administration deemed the verification measures they contain inadequate.

The task of the joint verification experiment, to put it in a couple of words, is to see in practice what improved monitoring methods it is expedient to use for verification of the 1974 treaty. We regard as entirely effective and adequate the teleseismic method, which does not require the presence at the test range of personnel carrying out measurements. For its part, the United States insists on the so-called hydrodynamic method, which is based on carrying out measurements actually at the test site.

The joint verification experiment will make it possible to take the discussion of this problem out of the sphere of theoretical discussions onto a practical plane and demonstrate the effectiveness, applicability, and convenience of the proposed methods, thereby providing a basis for decisionmaking.

[Correspondent] Could you describe in more detail the teleseismic and hydrodynamic methods of measuring the yield of an explosion?

[Mikhaylov] Teleseismic measurements of the yield of underground nuclear explosions are based on recording the amplitude of elastic vibrations of the ground at distances of 3,000-10,000 km from the site of the explosion. They make it possible to record sufficiently reliably, in virtually any part of the globe, explosions with a yield of a few kilotons. In our view it is entirely possible effectively to verify the 1974 treaty by this method. The holding of the joint verification experiment and the associated measures will make it possible in future to apply the teleseismic method with even greater accuracy.

Another important advantage of this method—as distinct from the hydrodynamic method—is that it offers the opportunity to monitor explosions of a very small yield. That was confirmed in the course of the experiment recently carried out by Soviet and U.S. scientists in the region of the Semipalatinsk and Nevada test ranges with explosions of conventional explosives.

In recent years seismological systems have been actively developed and improved. Today there is talk of creating an international global network for the exchange of seismological data, with the establishment of international centers for seismological data in a number of countries (Moscow in the USSR; Washington in the United States; Stockholm in Sweden; Canberra in Australia). The wide exchange of seismological data combined with international verification creates objective conditions for progress along the path of ending underground tests of nuclear weapons.

As for the hydrodynamic method of measuring the yield of an underground nuclear explosion, it is based on recording the position of the front of a strong shock wave that spreads in the ground at a speed in excess of the speed of sound at distances of 10-50 meters from the nuclear device. As a result of an explosion with a yield of 100-150 kilotons, at these distances solid strata, including rock strata, behave like a fluid. Hence the name of the method—hydrodynamic.

Measuring the yield of an explosion by the hydrodynamic method can be done in the main (combat) shaft. And if the container holding the nuclear charge is of a small size and has been manufactured without the use of special measures to distort the yield, then the accuracy of measurements can be fairly high. However, in this case there is a high probability of revealing highly sensitive information about the nuclear charge. If the charge

container is of a larger size, there can be serious distortion of the measurements. It should be noted that as a rule, American tests use precisely these large containers.

Another option is to conduct measurements in a specially bored auxiliary (measurement) shaft of small diameter, which must be 10-15 meters from the main shaft. Here the size of the container has less effect on the accuracy of the result (although if special camouflage measures are used, the error can still be significant). The possibility of revealing information not directly relating to the yield of the explosion is also reduced, but not entirely excluded. Moreover this procedure is far more closely and requires lengthy preparation: 3-4 months prior to each explosion to be monitored. And the accuracy of measurements is at best at the same level as with the use of seismic methods.

[Correspondent] How will the experiment be conducted?

[Mikhaylov] The procedure for conducting the joint experiment is defined by the statement of the USSR foreign minister and U.S. secretary of state on 9 December 1987, as well as the Soviet-U.S. agreement on the conduct of the joint experiment signed by them 31 May of this year in the course of the fourth Soviet-American summit meeting. This agreement governs a wide range of issues connected with the drilling of shafts, their dimensions, the recovery of ground specimens, the siting of apparatus, the exchange of data, the delivery of equipment and personnel to the two countries' test ranges, working conditions at the ranges, and so forth.

Within the framework of the joint verification experiment, two explosions will be carried out: one at the Semipalatinsk range and one in Nevada. Their yield must approach 150 kilotons, and in any event must not be less than 100 kilotons. On the basis of full reciprocity, the two sides will have the opportunity to measure the yield of the explosions, using both teleseismic and hydrodynamic methods.

Each side carries out teleseismic measurements of the two explosions within the joint experiment by means of its own national network of seismological stations.

To this end, the sides are to exchange beforehand the necessary information about five explosions carried out earlier at each side's test range and about their recording at five designated seismological stations, as well as information about the stations themselves and the conditions at the test ranges.

Hydrodynamic measurements at each range will be carried out both in the combat shafts and in auxiliary shafts, and it is agreed that the value obtained for the yield of the explosion by means of the hydrodynamic gauge in the combat shaft will be taken as the calibrating point. The experiment is to be organized in such a way as to ensure maximum accuracy of the calibrating measurements. At the same time, it must be noted that in general

the organization of the joint verification experiment at the Nevada range differs significantly from the standard conditions under which the American side conducts its tests.

In the course of the joint verification experiment, the so-called anti-intrusion measures, the aim of which is to prevent the uncovering of irrelevant information, will also be tested and subsequently analyzed.

[Correspondent] In describing the tasks of the joint verification experiment, you speak only of the 1974 treaty, but the 9 December 1987 statement to which you referred mentions both the threshold agreements. Why is this?

[Mikhaylov] This is because at the talks that have been in progress since last November, in parallel with preparations for the joint verification experiment, concrete accords are also being drawn up on the content of future measures for the verification of both treaties. The sides concluded that there is no need to wait for the results of the joint verification experiment before agreeing on improved measures for verifying the 1976 treaty, since the existing text of the treaty already includes provisions on the use of the hydrodynamic method for determining the yield of explosions for peaceful purposes and an understanding exists on the possibility of its wider application. This enabled the two countries' leaders, at the Moscow summit, to note substantial progress in preparing a new protocol to the Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes, and to instruct the delegations to complete it as soon as possible.

The 1974 Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests is a different matter. The existing protocol to that treaty does not provide for the use of the hydrodynamic method for verification purposes. The American side, as I have noted, insists on the use of this method at the test ranges. We believe, however, that at the test ranges the difficulties and intrusiveness of the hydrodynamic method could be apparent to the greatest degree. One hopes that the joint verification experiment will help us to answer the numerous questions that arise.

[Correspondent] What stage have the preparations and conduct of the joint experiment at the Semipalatinsk and Nevada test ranges now reached?

[Mikhaylov] Both the main (combat) shafts and the auxiliary (instrument) shafts have already been drilled at both ranges. At the Nevada test range, the drilling and measurement of the auxiliary shaft took place under the observation of Soviet experts. In the interests of the accuracy of the experiment, an agreement was reached whereby the Americans drilled the auxiliary shaft at the Semipalatinsk test range. Soviet equipment for hydrodynamic measurements has now been delivered to the United States, and will be sited in the region of the explosion. At the end of June, the sides are to exchange

full data on the 10 explosions (5 on each side) carried out earlier to back up the seismological method of measurements. In July, the American side's hydrodynamic equipment is to be shipped to the Semipalatinsk range. The explosions are scheduled for mid-August in Nevada and mid-September in our country. After this the sides will process the results of the measurements, carry out the analysis and exchange of seismological data, and embark on the elaboration of verification measures for the 1974 treaty. We hope this can be done in a very short space of time, so that we can move on to agreeing on further interim limitations on nuclear explosions.

The Soviet experts are flying to the Nevada range in a businesslike mood and with a sense of confidence in the fulfillment of the objectives and tasks of the joint verification experiment as the initial stage on the hard, uphill path to a general and complete ban on nuclear explosions.

Accreditation Ceremony Held

LD2106121488 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0420 GMT 21 Jun 88

[Text] San Francisco, 21 Jun (TASS)—An official ceremony of the accreditation of a group of Soviet scientists has been held in the village of Mercury, Nevada, where the administrative center of the nuclear test site of the U.S. Department of Energy is located. Twenty-five specialists came from the USSR to the Nevada desert to conduct a joint experiment with their American colleagues.

A nuclear charge with an installed capacity will be detonated at a depth of about 700 meters in mid-August. Scientists are to restore the main parameters of the explosion with the help of accurate seismic instruments placed in various parts of the test site and to compare them with control data. The first group of eight Soviet specialists, which has been in Nevada since April, took part in the preparation of the experiment. They have done a great deal already in the course of previous experiments at the test site.

A program of joint experiments was successfully started last year in Kazakhstan, at a test site near Semipalatinsk.

Preliminary results received last year in Kazakhstan and this spring in Nevada confirm initial calculations and show that it is practically impossible to conceal the conducting of underground explosions of even the smallest yield. Methods for refining data from seismic observations has been improved. It has emerged, for example, that the thickness of the soil in which the shafts of the Nevada test site are sunk reduces the shock wave of the explosion far more than do the mountainous ores in the Semipalatinsk area. This has enabled scientists and experts to explain the many different readings in the declared yields of the tests that have taken place in the past and to improve mutual understanding.

The joint research was designed for a protracted period, and future plans include the participation of scientists from other countries.

2 Nuclear Explosions Planned

LD2106064188 Moscow TASS in English 0630 GMT
21 Jun 88

[Text] San Francisco June 21 TASS—Spokesmen for the U.S. Department of Energy have reported that two nuclear explosions will be conducted at an underground test site in Nevada Wednesday. The two nuclear charges will be detonated simultaneously.

Since the beginning of nuclear tests in 1945 such experiments have been conducted on very rare occasions. The latest one took place 20 years ago. An approximate time of the explosions is 7 a.m. However, they can be postponed depending on weather conditions, primarily the strength and direction of the wind in the area of the test site. According to Jim Boyer, official spokesman for the Department of Energy, a total capacity of the two charges will be under 150 kilotons. Five declared nuclear tests have been conducted at the Nevada test site since the beginning of 1988.

Golts Views 9th Anniversary of SALT II Treaty

PM2006151588 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 17 Jun 88 First Edition p 3

[A. Golts article under the rubric "History: Dates and Reflections": "Treaty's Complex Fate"]

[Text] The Moscow summit meeting was distinguished by boldness, dynamism, and the desire to tackle the central problems of concern to mankind and to resolve them successfully. This is pointed out by the entire progressive public, which also wants the Soviet-U.S. dialogue to develop progressively, without halts or disruptions. But good intentions are not enough. It is necessary to foresee and prevent possible disruptions. And for this it is necessary to remember not only the positive but also the negative experience. It is of just such experience that the date 18 June reminds us. The Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Limitation of Strategic Arms (SALT II) was signed on this day 9 years ago. The work on it had been long and hard.

But, as a result, a document was created which reflected a balance of both sides' interests. The SALT II Treaty set limits on the then existing types of strategic offensive arms and limited the potential for modernizing those means. In short, it was meant to curb the nuclear arms race in its central salient. No less important was the fact that precisely this treaty registered the existence of Soviet-U.S. military-strategic parity. Observance of its provisions based on recognition of the principles of equality and identical security ensured strategic stability and served as a starting point for seeking ways to reduce and eliminate nuclear weapons.

It seems to me that the SALT II Treaty was a kind of "moment of truth" for the Carter administration. But, on perceiving this truth, the then U.S. leaders took fright and went into reverse. The ratification process was halted under pressure from right-wing conservative forces. However, the treaty was of such obvious significance for U.S. and Soviet security that the sides adopted a pledge not to go beyond the limits set by this agreement.

On acceding to power, the Reagan administration declared a real war on the treaty. And this is understandable, for it hampered the ambitious nuclear rearmament program which provided for a qualitative and quantitative buildup of each of the elements of the strategic triad. True, Washington could not at once openly renounce that agreement, and so it accused the USSR of allegedly violating SALT II. At the same time, administration spokesmen in point of fact avoided a serious examination of the way this agreement was being fulfilled. Soon, contrary to the opinion of the U.S. and international public and contrary to the opinion of its allies, the White House worked to demolish the treaty. At the end of 1986, by commissioning the 131st strategic bomber equipped with long-range cruise missiles, the United States unilaterally violated the treaty.

It has to be said that the timing was not accidental. For the Reykjavik meeting had already taken place and opened for a moment the door to a nuclear-free world. And then the "hawks" tried to lock that door forever with the help of provocations. They reckoned that the Soviet Union would respond by building up its strategic arms.

But these hopes of theirs were not realized. Declaring that the USSR was still refraining from exceeding the SALT restrictions, our country concentrated all its efforts on seeking political, not military means of ensuring security. Moscow did not let itself be enticed into the wilds of confrontation. It was this sense of balance, displayed against the background of the obstructionist U.S. stand, that made even Washington reconsider its approaches in some ways. As a result, the world obtained the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, and progress was made toward concluding an agreement on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms.

The complex history of the SALT II Treaty shows how difficult the path to nuclear disarmament is. Not only because of the unusually complex tasks which have to be resolved but also because we have a very difficult partner. Its approach to the treaties already concluded always remains problematic. A nihilistic approach was displayed not only to the SALT II Treaty. The question of compliance with the unlimited ABM Treaty is still very acute. As is known, compliance with it is a very important condition, given which, strategic offensive arms can be reduced. Agreement to this would already seem to have been reached at the highest level. But, with persistence worthy of better application, Washington is trying to modify the treaty. And it is doing this so that it can realize the notorious Strategic Defense Initiative in full and develop an arms race in space.

The reality is that we have to reach agreement precisely with the United States on the most important disarmament problems. And there must be no place here for euphoria if success is achieved nor for panic or anger if difficulties arise. This is precisely what the complex experience of the SALT II Treaty teaches.

'International Situation' on Military, PRC
LD1706225288 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0930 GMT 17 Jun 88

["International Situation—Questions and Answers" program, presented by All-Union Radio commentator Konstantin Patsyuk, with TASS military affairs observer Vladimir Bogachev; Colonel Viktor Ivanovich Filatov, member of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's editorial board; commentator Boris Adrianov; and Sergey Pravdin]

[Excerpts] [Patsyuk] Georgiy Semenovich Polovodskiy from Krasnoyarsk is interested in knowing what the concept of defensive or reasonable sufficiency in the structure of the armed forces means. We've asked TASS military affairs observer Vladimir Ivanovich Bogachev, to answer this one.

[Bogachev] In May 1987 the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact participant-states adopted a fundamentally important document on military doctrine. The document stresses, in particular, that the countries of the socialist community have no desire to possess any armed forces in excess of what is needed for defensive purposes.

[Patsyuk] But what does this mean in practice?

[Bogachev] Today, as in the past, far greater forces and means are required to conduct offensive operations than for defense. During World War II, for example, in order to conduct successful offensive operations it was essential to ensure a three-fold superiority over the defender's forces; a division would attack the combat formations of a defending regiment. The adoption of the concept of defensive sufficiency by all countries would mean a considerable reduction in the quantity of weapons and armed forces down to a level which is insufficient for conducting offensive operations.

[Patsyuk] Is that it?

[Bogachev] No, of course not. A defensive strategy or reasonable sufficiency will require not only an arms reduction, but also a deep reformation of military structures and troop deployment, and a change in the very nature of a state's military activities. First and foremost, it will be essential to dismantle the offensive core of the armed forces and scrap the most destabilizing forces and first-strike weapons systems.

[Patsyuk] You mentioned destabilizing weapons systems.

[Bogachev] These include, for instance, the U.S. Pershing-2 nuclear missiles, which are now due to be eliminated under the Soviet-U.S. treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. From their places of deployment, in direct proximity to vitally important facilities on the territory of the socialist countries, the Pershings can reach their targets in 8-12 minutes. This means that on

receiving a warning of attack, the other side has 2-3 minutes to make certain it is authentic and make decisions on a response to the aggressor. In this kind of situation there is a dramatic growth in the danger of a nuclear war, either by chance or as a result of a fault in the warning and communications systems. The large-scale anti-missile defense system currently being prepared by the United States is of an extremely destabilizing nature, because by creating the illusion that aggression will go unpunished, a large-scale ABM system may make it more tempting for certain hotheads to unleash a nuclear war.

[Patsyuk] As far as I understand it, all nuclear weapons are destabilizing and extremely dangerous.

[Bogachev] Yes, of course. Certain U.S. strategists are to this day convinced that a first use of nuclear weapons would give them a decisive military superiority. However, the nuclear component of strategy is the most aggressive catalyst of the arms race. This is precisely why we have to get rid of it.

[Patsyuk] The Soviet Union is deeply convinced of the possibility of ensuring the security of all countries without nuclear weapons. The socialist countries have declared that they are ready for mutual reductions of all types of offensive weapons, including tactical nuclear weapons, strike aviation, and tanks.

[Bogachev] The concept of defensive sufficiency adopted by the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact states is closely connected with a number of military-political obligations. In particular, they have stated that never under any circumstances will they begin military actions against any state or alliance of states unless they themselves become victims of aggression. The Warsaw Pact countries have assumed a solemn obligation not to make first use of nuclear weapons. The Warsaw Pact participant-states have no territorial claims on any country in or outside Europe. And there's one more important point that I'd like to draw attention to.

[Patsyuk] What's that?

[Bogachev] The concept of sufficiency in constructing armed forces ensues from the impossibility of victory in a nuclear war, or even in an arms race. The only reasonable task for armed forces in the nuclear age is to guarantee their own defense and that of their allies.

[Patsyuk] What are the criteria for determining the level of sufficiency in, let's say, strategic forces?

[Bogachev] Above all, it's their ability to ensure that no attack on the socialist countries will go unpunished, in any situation—even the most unfavorable. The inevitability of retribution has to be guaranteed, irrespective of whether the aggressor launches a nuclear strike unexpectedly or under conditions of a crisis situation, with regional or global aims, using a few nuclear warheads, or

by launching all his nuclear arsenal. The prospect of unacceptable damage, which is how the Pentagon measures the consequences of a reply strike, ought to cool even the hottest heads among apologists of limited or unlimited wars against the countries of the socialist community. Incidentally, this sufficiency potential is much lower than the nuclear weapons arsenals deployed in the world today.

[Patsyuk] To what extent are the limits of the Soviet Union's defensive sufficiency determined by the actions of NATO and the United States?

[Bogachev] They are linked in the most direct way. For instance, should the United States implement its Star Wars program, the Soviet Union will have to respond in order to preserve the balance and rule out the possibility of military gambles by the other side. Naturally, the USSR has no intention of ensuring its own security using recipes put together in the Pentagon. If the United States militarizes space, the USSR intends to respond with a more effective, more rapid, and less expensive reply. Naturally, if the U.S. SDI program is implemented, the Soviet Union will have to expand the limits of defensive sufficiency. The principle of reasonable sufficiency can be initially implemented through agreed asymmetrical arms reductions. One country with superiority in, let's say, the size of naval forces, would reduce its naval forces to the other country's lower level; and a country with superiority in, let's say, quantity and quality of tanks would reduce its armored troops.

[Patsyuk] Are there any proposals yet on specific armed forces levels for ensuring defensive sufficiency?

[Bogachev] I've already mentioned initial reductions to the level of the country which is behind in specified weapons. These levels are known, approximately. They can be clarified and checked; and this, incidentally, is being proposed by the Soviet Union. Further reductions would have to be agreed between all parties affected. The Soviet Union is consistently endeavoring to decisively reduce the level of military confrontation in the world and to reduce military potentials in such a way that both the West and the East are left only with the forces and means necessary for defense, but not sufficient for an attack. But this reduction in war arsenals must affect all countries. The most important thing is that all countries in the world, above all the United States and the USSR, instead of calculating the balance of forces, should devise a balance of common interests and be guided by it. This is what lies at the basis of the concept of reasonable sufficiency.

[Patsyuk] Thank you, Vladimir Ivanovich. [passage omitted in which Patsyuk explains history and principles of Nonaligned Movement] Our editorial board receives numerous letters on the situation in and around Afghanistan. The most varied problems are raised in letters from Comrades Shashlov from Volgograd Oblast; Belov

from Nikolayev; Cherkas from the village of Khonkovtsy, Vinnitsa Oblast; Koltsov from Kiev; Shevchenko from Kovel, Volyn Oblast; and Osadchiy from Voronezh Oblast.

Comrade Tkachenko from Kiev thinks, for instance, that having introduced our troops into Afghanistan, we were not even ready to carry out combat operations in mountainous conditions. We have asked Colonel Viktor Ivanovich Filatov, member of the KRASNAYA ZVEZDA editorial board, to reply to this and other questions posed in our letters. Please, go ahead.

[Filatov] In the first place, what is meant by the word, we? The Soviet people? Well then, for the sake of correctness, the Soviet people were not preparing themselves either for a mountainous, or a lowland, or any other war. If the whole of our army is meant here, then one cannot but agree with the author of the letter: Indeed, the whole army was not preparing itself for a mountainous war. Not the whole army, but only its limited contingent was on combat duty in Afghanistan. However, as is known, we have entire military okrugs—for instance the Transcaucasian Military Okrug, the military training of which takes place exclusively only in mountainous conditions.

I think, however, that here we are dealing with those soldiers who turned out in Afghanistan and, briefly, were there shortcomings among them?

War is no Red Square parade, but even there, as the troops are passing by, I observe no small number of shortcomings. But indeed, can the whole parade be judged by one or two people who broke ranks? If no mistakes were made at war, there would have been no victories either. Victory comes to those who make one less mistake than the enemy. History is our witness here: No one has ever succeeded in preparing himself for a war yet to come in a model, exemplary fashion. Why? It is because at war, one of the opposing sides is doing its best to make the other make mistakes, to slip up.

All the same, it is evidently necessary to speak of shortcomings where war is concerned. Writer Astafyev, for instance, thinks that during the Great Fatherland War, he, a junior sergeant at the time it seems, was given orders by the generals which were not quite what they ought to have been, and this was the case throughout the campaign. He wanted to advance—the generals ordered him back. He wanted to retreat—the generals ordered him to advance. Now it seems to Astafyev that he could have won with one division where the generals for some reason needed three to win. One can imagine a great many things looking at combat operations some 45 years later.

But to return to our subject. The war in Afghanistan brought shortcomings to light, too. You surely have facts at your disposal—naturally. Well, to give examples:

There were cases where four out of five shells [snaryad] fired at the bandits failed to explode. There was a case where four out of five bombs dropped on the bandit positions failed to go off.

I saw myself how, during a combat operation, an anti-tank gun went out of commission and nearly killed the loader into the bargain. This list can unfortunately be continued and continued. We are here talking of factory defects, and there is nothing suprising here. What would be suprising is if a tank factory, standing side by side with a combine or a tractor factory which produce combines and tractors incapable of moving along a field, produced tanks which roared along mountainous roads.

It would be very suprising if, with our Chernobyl and Arzamas disaster, we received shells which were faultless.

The same can be said also for helicopters and aircraft, for their armament and engines.

Our commanders and political workers do their utmost, arguing to prove that our equipment and arms are the most reliable and troublefree in the world. What can they do, though, when four out of five bombs fail to go off with soldiers looking on?

During wartime it is also very desirable to have disciplined soldiers in addition to reliable equipment. We currently exercise ourselves over the problem of the so-called irregular relations between servicemen [problema tak nazyvayemykh neustavnykh vzaimootnosheniy mezhdu voyenno sluzhashchimi].

We are indignant at the escalation of this in the army and navy. Of course, this also took place in Afghanistan. The selfsame lads went to do their tours of duty there. But here is a simple problem: It is said that crime among young people has doubled in the country during the last few years. What extent of the escalation of irregular relations between Army and Navy servicemen is to be expected, then?

The army is the country—but dressed in identical uniforms. At present, when we wish to show the highest degree of laxity and indiscipline, we speak of Chernobyl.

[Patsyuk] As far as I can remember, you wrote reports from there in May 1986?

[Filatov] Yes, that is correct. Well, for example, to take the problem of POW's in Afghanistan. I was in Afghanistan three times. Three hundred and eleven people were taken prisoner. Efforts to have them released from there commenced on the very same day and at the very same hour that the first soldiers of ours turned out to have been taken prisoner. Linked with this are stories which any detective story writer could only dream of. I know many such stories. Our soldiers were being liberated from captivity by their commanders who, during their

liberation, would show miracles of heroism, courage, diplomacy, and knowledge of what makes human beings tick. Some 70 people have been liberated by them to date. That is the way it is. You ask any soldier who was in captivity and he will tell you who dragged him out of there. These commanders live among us. They do not write to the papers offering them their diaries and recollections. At some future date, however, novels will be written about these events, and films will be made that seize the imagination.

The time will come for all this to make its appearance as, shall we say, the exact figure of our losses in Afghanistan made its appearance. But I remember, after all, just how much passion raged around this issue. I myself had occasion to say that our losses there will be reported as soon as military operations cease. Combat operations have ceased, and the figure has been named. You, comrade listeners, are aware of it.

And now for this: Why is it, all the same, that our lads find themselves taken prisoner by the bandits? It is, of course, a matter of regret; but save for the rarest of exceptions, people are taken prisoner for the very same reason—lack of discipline. For its laxity and indiscipline, the country paid the price of Chernobyl. For his laxity and indiscipline, the soldier in Afghanistan has captivity as punishment. Here he fell asleep at his post; there he wandered off without permission, away from his unit's position; or else he decided to have a drink of water from the spring not far away; or he resolved to have a look at an ancient mosque in the nearest village; or else, or else, or else.

Here, too, one can unfortunately go on for a long time. Encompassing all strata of our people, restructuring will doubtless have an effect on the whole of our army. The fewer mistakes we make in peacetime, the less of them there will be if something like Afghanistan happens. In general, the less Chernobyls we have, the less Afghansians we shall have.

[Patsyuk] [passage omitted on why Israel is strong enough to be able to confront the Arab world with impunity; Israeli foreign debt; international conference being the way out of the Near East impasse] We've been receiving a fair number of letters from people interested in the present state of, and prospects for, relations between our country and China. In particular, they are asking questions about the Soviet-Chinese talks on a border settlement. We've been asked to talk about this by, for instance, Yevgeniya Nikolayevna Yevtefeyeva from Rostov-on-Don; Fedor Kuzmich Davydov from Tambov; and many more. My colleague, commentator Boris Andrianov, has agreed to carry out your request.

[Andrianov] I think that our listeners are paying close attention to the way in which contacts between the Soviet Union and the PRC are developing. So we assume that you are aware that the 12th round of the Soviet-Chinese political consultations on questions pertaining

to normalizing bilateral relations is presently being held in Moscow. It began on 12 June and is due to end on the 20th. I mention this in order to stress that the political dialogue between our countries is continuing. Moreover, the overall state of Soviet-Chinese relations is improving from one round to the next of these meetings. As I see it, this healthy process is the result and a reflection of endeavors by the leaders of both countries to secure the positive evolution of bilateral relations, clearing away the incrustations of the past, and overcoming existing difficulties. The present stage of the Soviet-Chinese talks on a border settlement unquestionably ought to be seen as one of the specific manifestations of that tendency.

You may remember that the talks began for the first time in October 1969. They went on for 9 years, but produced no results and were suspended. We shall not now go into the reasons for what happened 10 years ago, since they lie in the complex nature of Soviet-Chinese relations at that time. This is a question of a special nature which requires further analytical study.

To get back to our subject of discussion, I would like to note what specifically served as a stimulus for the resumption of the Soviet-Chinese border talks. The stimulus was Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement that the official border between the Soviet Union and China on the water boundaries could run along the main fairway. This point is of a very substantial nature, because our border with China is the longest in the world—7,500 km—and most of it runs along two rivers—the Ussuri and the Amur. That eastern section of the border is 4,300 km in length. The point, of course, is not the length itself.

One ought to bear in mind that the treaties on our country's borders with China were signed as far back as the previous century—more than 100 years ago. Quite naturally, over such a period various kinds of natural changes in the relief could have occurred, causing in some places a deviation from the formerly established boundary line. This applies particularly to the water boundaries, where currents often alter a river's depth and produce sandbanks and even entire islands. This is why at the beginning of the new stage of the border talks in February of last year in Moscow, the two countries' representatives agreed to embark immediately on an examination of the course of the Soviet-Chinese border line, starting with the eastern section. The successful commencement of these talks was regarded as a new step in the development of Soviet-Chinese relations, and deservedly so. The official representatives of the two states are expressing the conviction that the settlement of border issues between the USSR and the PRC, and the transformation of the Soviet-Chinese border into one of friendship and goodneighborliness would be of great significance, not only for both countries but for the cause of peace in Asia and worldwide as well.

It should be noted that these talks are of a closed nature, since both sides have agreed not to publicize details of the problems under discussion. I think this is necessitated by the intention of tackling those issues on the

basis of equality and in a spirit of mutual flexibility and good-neighborliness, with due consideration for the legitimate interests of both the Soviet Union and China. If the details of this far from simple process were to be made public this would hardly be conducive to its successful development. After all, it's not the details but the final outcome of these serious talks which really matter. What is far more important is that the talks are progressing with increasing momentum, as confirmed by the establishment of a working group. The Soviet and Chinese experts who form this group have already coordinated, in particular, issues connected with plans to carry out a joint aerial photographic survey of the eastern section of the Soviet-Chinese border.

This bears witness to increased trust between the participants in the talks and to the amicable and frank atmosphere in which they are working. This is a highly encouraging factor. [passage omitted in which Patsyuk comments on Reagan, Kennedy children; Pravdin views U.S. forces' Delta anti-terrorist unit, Green Berets, being a weapon of U.S. imperialism; and Patsyuk on why the League of Communists of Yugoslavia is so named, on what happened after the Madrid Socialist International voted to have Israel's Likud party expelled, on where fascism originated, on the fate of Nazi criminal Martin Bormann, the Oscar statuette and its history, and the history of Nepal]

'Observers Roundtable' on U.S. 'Hegemonist' Ideas
LD1906172788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1130 GMT 19 Jun 88

["International Observers Roundtable" program, with presenter Nikolay Agayants; Boris Vasiliyevich Andrianov, Moscow radio foreign political commentator; and Yuriy Emmanuilovich Kornilov, TASS political observer]

[Text] [Agayants] Hello, comrades. Let me first introduce those taking part in today's meeting. They are my colleague, Boris Vasiliyevich Andrianov, Moscow Radio foreign political commentator, and Yuriy Emmanuilovich Kornilov, TASS political observer.

The 24th week of 1988 has been marked by events of widely differing scale and significance on the international scene, among which I think we should note the completion in New York of general discussions at the third special UN General Assembly session on disarmament. The foreign media have given the session extensive coverage, emphasizing the beneficial effects of the Soviet-U.S. Summit in Moscow. There have been positive responses by many states to the new Soviet peace initiative contained in the speech by USSR Foreign Minister Shevardnadze and to the memorandum, Security Through Disarmament, which was submitted by Warsaw Treaty member countries.

[Andrianov] Judging by the discussions, there was a general conviction among the session's participants that Soviet and U.S. disarmament efforts must be supplemented by multilateral efforts. May I remind you especially that FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher spoke in this connection about the principle of positive constructivism. Incidentally, on certain main issues on the agenda—like reducing nuclear arms and banning chemical weapons—the session showed an incomparably greater uniformity of opinion than the previous one. The opinions of the majority of participants in the discussion are clearly coming closer together regarding banning nuclear weapon tests. It was clear that the well-known doctrine of nuclear deterrence took stronger criticism from the rostrum of the General Assembly special session than in previous years. All these things are very positive and symptomatic.

[Kornilov] I must add this: At the special disarmament session in New York, there was serious criticism in the debates, possibly for the first time, of certain developing countries which are, on an increasingly large scale, being drawn into the arms race. This inevitably condemns those countries to impoverishment and new debts.

[Agayants] The session has proved once again that the new thinking in international relations is making a path for itself with difficulty and is feeling the effect of the obvious opposition by the forces that cling to past stereotypes. Echoes of these unconstructive approaches to the most important problems of our time were reflected in U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz' speech to the special session on 13 June.

Yes, the U.S. delegation head spoke highly of the four meetings between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan, and of the progress achieved in bilateral relations; yes, Shultz spoke in his New York speech of the need to go further down the path toward concluding an agreement to reduce Soviet and U.S. strategic nuclear arsenals by 50 percent. I do not know whether we will manage to conclude that treaty this year, but we will make every effort to do so; this is the prime task of the United States in the area of arms control, he said. That is fine, is it not? But....

[Andrianov, interrupting] Alas, once again the unconstructive element was present. As an example, the U.S. secretary of state supported the idea of concluding an international convention to ban chemical weapons, and condemned the proliferation both of nuclear weapons and of improved forms of conventional ones. But there was not a word in his speech in answer to the Soviet initiative, voiced from the rostrum of the United Nations, on banning tests of nuclear weapons. Yet this, after all, would be one of the most effective measures against the spread of these weapons of mass destruction.

The proposals of the so-called Group of Six socialist states and of a number of the Western countries make a good start and lay a good foundation for this. And, as

Comrade Shevardnadze said in his address to the special session in New York, if for any reason it is difficult to make a start immediately on drawing up the text of a treaty to ban tests completely, then here, too, it would be possible to take it in stages and set about examining a system of monitoring [kontrol]; but on no account should we mark time. That is a clear position, and as constructive as you could wish. Without limiting and banning nuclear tests, it is surely difficult—or rather, altogether impossible—to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons across the planet.

As our proposals make clear, action in this direction could be reinforced by setting up nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world. That, by the way, is an idea that is today becoming increasingly popular and widespread. In a word, only serious and purposeful work and mutually complementary efforts on the bilateral and multilateral levels will lead to success. Unfortunately, we have yet to hear a positive response to this initiative from Washington. And, in effect, the secretary of state also evaded the problem in his speech at the special session.

[Agayants] It gave considerable prominence to an exposition of the American and NATO approach to reduction of conventional arms and armed forces in Europe. But there was no mention of any specific measures to achieve this. The United States doesn't believe in peace on a basis of weakness, and doesn't recommend others to believe in it; therefore, it is necessary to be strong, said Shultz. A dubious variation on an old and well-worn theme.

The events of the past 3 years show convincingly that the new political thinking correctly reflects the urgent requirements and imperatives of world development. It has revived the hopes of all people of good will for the possibility of averting a nuclear catastrophe and achieving security. It has opened the way to a qualitative breakthrough in the minds of men and increased the real weight of world public opinion. As has been noted in the Theses of the CPSU Central Committee for the 19th All-Union Party Conference, we are not disregarding the militarist danger lurking in the nature of imperialism. This determines Soviet defense construction, the effectiveness of which must henceforth be ensured by qualitative parameters, both as regards technology and as regards the personnel of our Armed Forces. The effect of the realities of the modern world, and the possible modification of a number of the objective factors that have begotten wars, make it possible to think that provision for the security of states will more and more be displaced from the sphere of the correlation of military potentials into the sphere of politics and of the primacy of law, universal human morality and fulfillment of international obligations.

On Wednesday the 15th, it was just a month since the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan came into force. That's not a long time, but the course of events has

shown that it has been fully sufficient in order to bring out the true attitude of those who signed those agreements in the Geneva package. What can be said in this connection is that the Soviet Union, whose policy is based on respect for the Afghan people and its values, and on full recognition of its independence, autonomy and nonalignment, has begun, and is continuing, the withdrawal of its troops from Afghanistan according to the timetable that has been laid down—thereby demonstrating its firm determination to follow fully and to the end the spirit and letter of the agreements.

[Andrianov] The Government of the Republic of Afghanistan—and this is recognized both by the UN observers and all objective observers from the international press—is demonstrating the same determination, and continuing its course toward national reconciliation and toward making the coalition and multiparty principle a reality both in the highest organs of power and in the local ones, and involving in the country's governance all forces which are sincerely concerned about its destiny, without exception.

[Kornilov] That's one line, dictated by the desire to extinguish a dangerous hotbed of tension in Asia. But of course there is also another, which is the direct opposite. The initiators of this line are out to undermine the very crux and essence of the Geneva package, which is, as you know, that all outside interference in Afghan affairs must be stopped. Today, a month after the Geneva agreements came into force, one can observe that interference of this sort has not only not ceased, but is, on the contrary, being intensified. The press and the news agencies report, almost daily, facts proving that official Pakistani Government organizations are stepping up the transfer to Afghanistan of detachments of the armed opposition and caravans transporting arms; and that the bases in Pakistan where the terrorists are trained are still actively functioning. What is this but a direct and crude violation of the undertakings contained in the Geneva package? The group of UN observers in Kabul has already been handed—on the basis of the figures that applied on 18 June—28 notes from the Afghan Foreign Ministry relating to numerous instances of violation of the Geneva agreements.

[Agayants] In their comments on the actions of Islamabad, many observers note that the stepping-up of interference in Afghan affairs has coincided in time with a period in which the internal political situation in Pakistan itself has worsened: In other words, with the removal of the prime minister and the dissolution of Parliament and the National Assembly. Is this just a coincidence?

[Kornilov] I don't think a coincidence like that can be a matter of chance. Notice that, in speaking of what lies behind the events in Pakistan, a number of foreign press organs recall the disagreements between the country's president, Ziaul Haq, and the former prime minister,

Junejo, on a number of foreign policy problems—including, and perhaps above all, the Afghan problem. I had an opportunity—this was before the Geneva agreements—of meeting and talking with Prime Minister Junejo in Islamabad during a journalistic visit to Pakistan. In the course of that conversation, he persistently—and, as it seemed to me, sincerely—spoke to the effect that the Afghan problem must be settled by political means and as fast as possible. The stance of General Ziaul Haq is quite a different matter. You can judge it, for example, by the fact that Ziaul Haq said just the other day in an interview with a Western magazine that the Geneva agreements were nothing other than a fig leaf, and went on to express in the same breath the hope that the armed opposition will continue to receive support from the United States.

[Agayants] The U.S. magazine THE NATION has just published a report of the scale of that support. In the few weeks during which the Geneva agreements on a settlement in Afghanistan were signed—writes the magazine—the United States delivered to the rebels via Pakistan between \$600 and \$700 million worth of arms. Later, C-130 transport planes flew into Pakistan arms to the value of between \$350 and \$450 million. I think the figures speak for themselves.

[Kornilov] And here's an additional fact. The U.S. newspaper THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR has just reported that representatives of Pakistan's military intelligence are trying to put pressure on the leaders of the armed Afghan opposition to begin a major offensive against the capital of Afghanistan, Kabul. And the U.S. depositors who are behind all operations of this sort are at the greatest pains to ensure that their contributions yield dividends, as it were, in the form of a continuation of the bloodshed. Matters have gone so far that two U.S. senators, Byrd and Dole, who are urging more effective collaboration with the opposition forces, have proposed that the U.S. State Department should appoint at the rebel headquarters a roving ambassador from Washington to coordinate, as they put it, U.S. policy on the spot.

[Agayants] Well, how can they do that? That means that these gentlemen are advocating that Washington, which has diplomat relations with Afghanistan should set up another diplomatic mission, this time in the camp of the armed opposition, which openly calls for the overthrow of the legitimate Afghan Government! Such an idea, if one can call it that, is rubbish, nonsense, a provocation and a mockery of the elementary norms of international law.

[Kornilov] Well, the idea in question indeed has nothing to do with international law; but it does have a direct bearing on Pakistan's attempts to cancel the Geneva package. In general, everything that we've been saying, all these facts that we've been citing here today, have a common denominator: All this is a direct or lightly

veiled continuation and intensification of that same interference in Afghanistan's affairs the cessation of which was agreed on in Geneva.

[Agayants] Here, I believe, it is appropriate to recall the meeting of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev with Najibullah, the president of Afghanistan, which is known to have taken place on 12 June. In the course of the meeting, serious concern was expressed about the violation of the Geneva agreements on the part of the Pakistani Administration. And it was stated with the utmost emphasis that the Soviet Union and Afghanistan are counting on the UN's control mechanism ultimately taking effective measures to put an end to this practice which, if it continues, will make it imperative to take the most decisive retaliatory action. As we can see, the process of settling the regional conflict surrounding Afghanistan is occurring in a far from simple manner. But this is not the only hot spot on the Asian continent and among them a particular place is occupied by the crisis in the Middle East.

[Kornilov] The core of the crisis is the Arab-Israeli conflict. It is one of the most protracted and explosive. It is sufficient to recall that 21 years have passed since the time of the so called 6-Day War. As a result of it, Israeli seized and occupied Arab lands—the Gaza sector, the West Bank of the River Jordan, East Jerusalem, the Syrian and the Golan Heights. Now the Palestinian uprising in the occupied territories has been going on already for 7 months. The "iron fist" policy that Tel Aviv is pursuing there is not producing the results that the rulers of Israel desire. They were not able for all that to bring the Palestinian population to its knees, in spite of the extremely cruel repressions perpetrated by the members of the punitive expeditions.

[Andrianov] Yes, against the background of those events the fact is particularly clear that the seizure and retention by the Israeli army of Palestinian and some other lands has turned out to be a serious strategic error both for the aggressors and for their patrons. In this chronic situation fraught with complications, the issue of eliminating the consequences of the aggression, of liberating the occupied Arab territories, of implementing the lawful rights of the Palestinian people, and of ensuring the security of all the states and people in the region, including Israel and the Palestinians, of establishing a just and lasting peace in the region, is and always has been, a serious one.

[Agayants] The Arab-Israeli conflict has truly entered a phase when the task of unblocking it as soon as possible has become a pressing requirement of the times. It is quite obvious that the preservation of the explosive situation in the Middle East is contrary to the change for the better that has taken shape in international relations. Naturally, a situation like that in no way matches the interests of the people in that region.

[Andrianov] Now even in Washington they have begun to comprehend that it is necessary to alleviate the acute Middle East situation.

Nor is it for no reason that U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz went there this month—for the fourth time this year. He keeps on trying to get a U.S. plan going for a settlement of Middle East problems. To put it bluntly, the plan is a limited one. Instead of a comprehensive settlement, half steps like limited autonomy for the Palestinians are being proposed. But the secretary of state's last mission was a failure, too. The Israeli hawks are displeased by the fact that the United States recognizes that the solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict should be based on the liberation of occupied Arab territories, as they say, in exchange for peace. The Arab leaders then object to the fact that Washington is persistently trying to exclude the PLO from the Middle East settlement process.

[Kornilov] But it is known that after this last trip by Shultz, an extraordinary session of Arab heads of state and government met in Algeria. In summing up its results, the British agency REUTER notes that the Arab world has in fact let the U.S. Middle East settlement plan drop, having unanimously appealed for the creation of an independent Palestinian state and having affirmed support for the PLO. End of quote.

It is very important that the Arab leaders spoke out in support of the convocation of an international Middle East conference under UN aegis with the participation of the five permanent Security Council members and all interested parties, naturally including the PLO as well.

[Andrianov] Of course, neither Israel nor the Arab countries should attempt to achieve any kind of one-sided advantage as a result of this step. Otherwise, a possible compromise over territory would be left up in the air. Once again, we would find ourselves faced with a further aggravation of the military and political crisis in the Middle East. This means that a settlement in the region cannot be a separate one, as was undertaken at Camp David, where Israel, with U.S. assistance, is known to have made a deal with Egypt.

[Kornilov] Moreover, it is precisely this deal that Tel Aviv keeps referring to as an example purportedly worthy of imitation, when it insists on bilateral negotiations with Jordan. It does, moreover, look as if King Husayn is prepared to accept all of Israel's conditions, conditions that are essentially an ultimatum. Time, however, and the course of events have shown that the Camp David deal did not lead—nor could it lead—to a solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict. It turns out that such a precedent, and I put this word in quotation marks, is evidently a precedent of a negative nature. It only confirms that separate deals cannot serve as a suitable means of attaining a settlement to Middle East problems.

[Agayants] Here it is probably appropriate to remind you that the initiator of the holding of such a conference was the Soviet Union. Why is it necessary to recall that? Because the United States and Israel would very much like to get away with that conference without us being present.

[Andrianov] What is there to be said on this subject? To all appearances, the United States, and Western Europe as well, are from force of habit continuing to consider that only their so-called vital interests exist and affect the Middle East. This evidently holds the answer to the question of why the United States has not wanted to talk to us as equals in the Middle East up until now and is striving to preserve its monopoly as an intermediary between Israel and the Arabs. Moreover, in the West they are trying to explain our support for the just struggle of the Arab people of Palestine by provocative accusations aimed at the Palestinians, who are supposed to be virtual agents of the Soviet Union. That is, of course, an evil intention. But even today Western propaganda bodies eagerly circulate it.

[Kornilov] Well, let us nevertheless leave these discourteous exercises, to put it mildly, on the conscience of those who are engaged in them and move on to the real motives for our initiative. Here it should be said that in forwarding its proposals and, later, specific ideas about an international Mideast conference, the Soviet Union proceeded from, and proceeds from, the vital need to restore peace as quickly as possible in the region and unblock this chronic and protracted military and political crisis, which is really the most protracted crisis since World War II.

[Agayants] The key problem in a Middle East settlement boils down to a solution of the Palestinian problem, and this can and must be done only with active PLO participation. Without the PLO, any attempt to achieve this goal is simply unrealistic.

[Andrianov] The Soviet Union is advocating that everything at the conference be resolved on the basis of a political settlement that takes into account the interests of all the participating sides and that, of course, takes into account the principled provisions of the appropriate UN resolutions.

[Kornilov] I would add the following important point. The question will inevitably arise at the conference of international guarantors of peace in the region. One cannot do without that. We consider that the Soviet Union and the United States, along with other permanent member nations of the UN Security Council, might act as such guarantors of peace in the region, which means as guarantors of the peaceful coexistence of Israel within internationally recognized borders—that is to say, the borders that will be determined by the conference on the Near East and, of course, with the agreement of all involved and interested sides.

[Andrianov] I think that attention should be drawn to a circumstance about which Washington and Tel Aviv prefer, as the saying goes, to think aloud. I have in mind the striving by American and Israeli politicians to make the Soviet Union earn some sort of pass mark in order to qualify for participation in an international conference. It is a matter of the establishment of diplomatic relations between Tel Aviv and Moscow, the opening of channels for the mass emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel, the proclamation of national cultural autonomy for the Jews in our country, and of other things too.

[Agayants] In this regard I think that one ought to express the firm conviction that the Soviet Union owes nothing to anyone in the Near East, whether it be Israel or the United States. Therefore, why put forward some kind of preliminary conditions, if they can be so called? Is it not better right now to get down to the practical preparation of an international conference on the Near East? And when, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has said, a normal and effective conference—and not simply an umbrella for separate negotiations—a forum that would be interlinked with bilateral, trilateral, and other forms of work, begins, we shall be ready to busy ourselves with questions relating to diplomatic relations with Israel. So, as you see, a further new element is being inserted into the matter of a Near East settlement. This shows that the Soviet Union stands firmly on the ground of reality and a recognition of a balance of interests, which is needed for the attainment of a lasting and just peace in the Near East. However, this task can be solved only if and providing that all the interested sides display a responsible approach, and the principles of the new political thinking in international affairs become part of the fabric of politics and diplomacy in this area, and if confrontation is replaced by a constructive quest for mutually acceptable solutions to the problems that exist. There is no other way to achieve the goal.

[Kornilov] If one generalizes somewhat what has been said by us here today, both the U.S. position on the Near East and to all intents and purposes its position on Afghanistan, and I would add to this such facts as Washington's unceasing threats against sovereign Nicaragua and the U.S. support for the RSA racists who are continuing their armed forays against their neighbors—if one generalizes all this, it all shows that the dangerous and essentially hegemonist concepts of neoglobalism drawn up in Washington have by no means been relegated to the archives even at the present moment, despite the positive changes in the world. This really was confirmed during the recent Soviet-U.S. meeting in Moscow. As is known, the Soviet side proposed to the U.S. President that the joint statement include the provision that no contentious problems should be solved by military means, that peaceful coexistence be regarded as a universal principle of internal relations and noninterference in internal affairs, and freedom of one's sociopolitical choice are recognized as inalienable and mandatory norms for everyone. However, the U.S. side rejected this formula, and that is also well known.

[Agayants] I would remind you that at his news conference President Reagan explained that his aides had perceived potentially ambiguous places in it.

[Andrianov] That explanation explained little. The it's were dotted a few days ago by THE WASHINGTON POST, which states that, had such a formula been included in the joint Soviet-U.S. statement, it would have run counter to Washington's course of actively assisting anticommunist rebels in various countries within the framework of the so-called Reagan doctrine. In other words, it is a matter of the fact that certain circles in the United States—and this is, I repeat, wholly corroborated by the facts about which we have been speaking today—these circles are continuing to proceed on the basis that wherever possible, it is necessary to attempt by force to make sovereign countries and peoples live by U.S. rules.

[Kornilov] Here is what has been said by Marshall Shulman, a leading U.S. political scholar. I shall quote: Although a settlement in the sphere of nuclear armaments is indeed necessary for the improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations, unpredictable and explosive conflicts might sooner involve the super-powers in a dangerous confrontation than, say, the divergence of their interests in Europe.

Well, I am not convinced that it makes sense to place the problems of disarmament or the problems of Europe in opposition to the issues of a settlement of regional conflicts. However, the fact that the existence of so-called hotspots leads to a heightening of tension and, after the dangerous reefs of confrontation have been overcome, hampers the emergence of Soviet-U.S. relations onto the broad path of cooperation and trust, is indisputable.

[Agayants] This is even more reason for Washington to give up at last its dangerous neoglobalist ambitions and to bring its own words and deeds into accord in Asia, the Near East, Central America and southern Africa.

Here we come to the end of our roundtable get-together. All those taking part thank you, esteemed comrade listeners, for your attention. All the best until we meet again!

'International Review' on F-16's, Afghanistan
PM1906115188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
19 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[Gennadiy Zafesov "International Review": "The World This Week"—first paragraph boldface as published]

[Text] The fourth Soviet-U.S. summit meeting has been universally acclaimed. This is a fact that requires no proof. But even if someone were to have doubts, a glance in the mirror, so to speak, of the world press would be sufficient.

Continuing the discussion on the Moscow meeting's outcome, it pays due credit to its results, noting that a new and real opportunity for disarmament has emerged.

Light and Shadows [subhead]

There are now perhaps more politicians than ever before who realize the danger of a further buildup of the piles of weapons and who consequently reflect on how this problem might be solved. It can also be noted that the improvement of the international climate, which has been favorably affected by our restructuring, has generated new hopes among the peoples, based on tangible positive results like the Soviet-U.S. treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles and the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan. Of course, it would be desirable to see the freeway to stable peace becoming increasingly wide, with fewer amber, let alone red, traffic signals along it. Unfortunately, good wishes quite often come up against totally specific opposition.

Emotions apart, it obviously must be admitted that there are different approaches toward the disarmament problem, toward its actual concept and its practical implementation alike, which today apply the brakes on this process. Behind these, of course, stand certain states, politicians, and people whose interests are directly or indirectly linked to military production. Proceeding from this premise, it is possible to explain why disarmament on the planet is not taking strides that are as long and as smooth as might be desired.

Let us be blunt, there are forces—some highly influential forces, and primarily in the United States—striving to do away with the Soviet-U.S. accords which have been reached. Of course, any direct attacks and sabotage are now unattractive from the public's point of view. This is why the adversaries of disarmament and improvement of the international climate prefer to act covertly and, as far as possible, without superfluous publicity.

An example is offered by the story involving the U.S. F-16 fighter-bombers, which were refused further hospitality by Spain. It is hard to refrain from paying due tribute to this step. And this is not at all a question of malicious glee resulting from the frictions developing within NATO. Spain's stance generates respect because the country had been subjected to considerable pressure from across the ocean and from some of its European neighbors, and also because the interests of national security gained the upper hand over so-called "Atlantic solidarity." Moreover, the ensuring of national security took the form of reducing the stockpiles of weapons on Spanish soil. This is a highly promising approach toward the problem: After all, arms reduction, even if only in an individual region, will no doubt have a positive effect on the prospects of disarmament in general.

But the development of events proved that the forces opposing the idea of disarmament are finding new paths and new supporters. The United States is totally unwilling to give up its F-16's and to withdraw them from NATO's southern flank. Now Italy is promising to offer them a safe haven. This was the main topic of talks during the visit to the United States by Italy's Prime Minister Luigi Ciriaco de Mita, which has only just ended. He had talks with President R. Reagan, Secretary of State G. Shultz, and Secretary of Defense F. Carlucci.

The head of the Italian Government was not held back by the fact that the Italian Parliament's Chamber of Deputies refused to expedite the discussion of this question in the supreme legislative organ of the Italian Republic. This means that by no means everyone in the Apennine peninsula is in a hurry to make their land available for yet another U.S. base.

L. Ciriaco de Mita made a typical statement before leaving Rome by plane. To start with, he mentioned the special importance of his trip to Washington, "insofar as it is taking place after the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting." He thus paid tribute to these times and to the changes which have taken place in international life. But one of his other theses offers food for thought: "Experience in the last few years has shown us that a patient and determined quest for a restoration of balance at a steadily declining level of arms is possible provided no initiatives on unilateral disarmament are implemented." It would be interesting to find out who is actually intending to disarm "unilaterally?" Surely not NATO? Could this be a veiled hint to NATO to make it slow down, as it were? At least the readiness of some of Italy's leaders to offer the country's territory to the U.S. F-16's justifies making such a supposition.

Let me remind readers that the relocation of U.S. F-16's in Italy brings them closer to the territories of the USSR and our allies. After all, the nuclear systems which these aircraft are capable of carrying on board can totally replace the cruise missiles which are now in Comiso and are due to be destroyed under the treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. Could this be the "balance of forces" that is so often spoken of in West Europe? It can be most categorically said that the replacement of one group of nuclear arms by another is not a promising path. At best, it would result in marking time. At worst, it could even further the arms buildup, taking into account the latest discoveries, technologies, and achievements.

But why is Italy taking this path? Evidently because there are enough politicians in the country who are totally unwilling to abandon the old doctrines and believe only in the strength of the "nuclear umbrella." Of course, nobody says this openly—it would appear anachronistic. But this trend is quite clearly perceptible. Italy's Defense Minister V. Zanone, for example, believes that the relocation of the F-16's from Spain to Italy "conforms with the requirement not to aggravate the geographical

asymmetry in military strength and not to create conditions for differences in ensuring security to the detriment of the southern regions." In other words, the minister is advocating consolidation of NATO's southern flank. But the minister does not halt there. He is also trying to lay "philosophical foundations." While admitting that the only positive experience in disarmament has been acquired as a result of the conclusion of the treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, he draws an amazing conclusion: The signing of the treaty was preceded by "a leveling of the imbalance of forces through the deployment of intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Italy and some other European countries" beforehand. And there it is! It appears that an arms "buildup" is necessary before the levels of arms can be reduced. Unfortunately, Italy's defense minister is not the sole champion of this "concept."

It has been known for a long time, however, that the correctness of theoretical assumptions is best verified by specific practice. At the third special UN General Assembly session, the Soviet Union proposed the total elimination of the presence of foreign troops and military bases on other countries' territory by the year 2000. An impressive political guideline! It is unfortunate that the old thinking and conservative ideas of some of our political opponents prevent them from taking a more realistic look at the issues. The process of disarmament is only at the initial stage of its path, and it would be much more beneficial for all countries and people without exception if this highway were to be illuminated by the light of constructiveness and be less affected by the shadows of prejudice.

Agreements Must Be Observed [subhead]

The words of this subhead have come down to us from distant antiquity. They sum up the experience of many peoples and many generations. This, if you like, is one of the principles on which the very existence of our diverse and contradictory world must be built. Indeed, if sides reach accord on something, express their will, taking into account the wishes and desires of the other side, and append their signatures to this accord, then it is that much more logical and natural to expect specific results. Provided, of course, that all sides are scrupulously conscientious. As a matter of fact, it is on this that relations in the world community must be built. This is the only way to ensure respect for, and confidence in, international treaties and agreements. Otherwise, any bad faith by one of the sides would jeopardize the attainment of the set goal.

All this fully applies to the situation around Afghanistan. The Geneva agreements on Afghanistan paved the way toward peace in this region of our planet. This way was arduous and long. The sides had to display patience, perspicacity, realism, and certainly good will in order to find a way out of a situation which appeared deadlocked until quite recently. Without any false emotionalism, let us note the tremendous contribution that was made by

the Soviet and Afghan sides. The USSR's words do not diverge from its deeds: We are precisely and swiftly implementing the withdrawal of the Soviet contingent of troops from Afghanistan. A factor which many Western politicians perceived as the stumbling block is being eliminated. Let me repeat myself: swiftly and precisely. A number of regions are already without Soviet troops. Like, for example, all along the Afghan-Pakistani border.

What is being done in response by some other parties to the Geneva agreements? By Pakistan, for example.

This country is committing one gross violation after another. A few days ago the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Afghanistan handed to the group of UN observers its 26th protest note in this regard. Caravans with weapons for the insurgents are still coming through from Pakistan. There are more than 100 training centers in the border regions, where mercenaries from the so-called "Islamic regiments" are being armed and trained. The movement of weapons and ammunition from there to Afghan territory to arm the opposition is still continuing.

There are evidently several reasons for this political line of Islamabad's. It is no secret that, over the last few years, Pakistan received and continues to receive military-economic aid from the West. It is possible that Pakistan's ruling circles are unwilling to lose it, fearing that any normalization of the situation in the region would leave them without the influx of money which was channeled into Pakistan as a "frontline state." It is also obvious that the seat of tension next door helped to distract the attention of the country's public from serious domestic problems, of which Pakistan has more than enough. Moreover, the ruling clique feels uncomfortable in its awareness of the growing opposition.

This was recently demonstrated with utmost clarity by the fact that Pakistan's President Ziaul Haq dismissed Prime Minister Junejo and disbanded Parliament. Many observers noted that the contradictions between prime minister and president included differences of opinion on the fulfillment of the Geneva accords regarding Pakistan's pledges not to interfere in any way in the internal affairs of the Republic of Afghanistan. The president of Pakistan repeatedly indicated that he would like to see Islamic fundamentalists from the "Alliance of Seven" in power in Kabul. Hence the obvious patronage for the extremist wing of Afghan opposition. I do not intend to hand out advice, but it seems to me that such an emphasis in Pakistan's foreign policy would hardly make education available to the one-third of Pakistan's population who are still illiterate. Nor will it produce the drinking water which is in such short supply for millions of Pakistanis. It will probably not reduce the military expenditure which now swallows 30 percent of the budget.

The more than 100 million Pakistanis making up the country's population are tired of the constant restrictions in political, economic, and social life with which they have had to put up, supposedly because of "external" factors. Such political manipulations have been known ever since ancient times, and they have never produced stable and positive results. The course of interference in Afghan affairs, the training of armed formations, and their transportation into Afghanistan are blatantly barren and fruitless, like a dried-up river bed.

Nonetheless, Pakistan's line enjoys support and succor in Washington. U.S. Senators R. Byrd and R. Dole have only just issued a call to appoint a special envoy to Afghanistan. What it boils down to is that such an emissary would in fact guide the actions by opposition groupings and would "monitor actions by the resistance." These are the functions planned for the special envoy! Instead of contacts with the legitimate Government, it is assumed that he would "closely cooperate with the resistance." It cannot be ruled out that the senators' "idea" would be backed by other members of Congress and would be supported by the White House.

The experience accumulated during the process of solving the Afghan problem testifies that there is only one way—political settlement. And this course, aimed at national reconciliation in Afghanistan, is gaining the growing sympathy of the Afghan people who wish to create a system for ruling the country which would include, without any exception, all forces that are sincerely concerned with the country's future.

The international public, the peace-loving states, and the UN monitoring mechanism created to observe the fulfillment of the Geneva agreements cannot and must not disregard the unilateral violation of these crucial accords. It is time to take effective measures to block all violations of the Geneva agreements. It is hard to understand and explain the stance taken by the United States, which seems to be forgetting that it, together with the Soviet Union, bears special responsibility since these two countries are guarantors of the Geneva accords.

Now there is a real chance to bring peace to the long-suffering land of Afghanistan. It would be immoral and unforgivable to miss it.

Rogachev on Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
PM1706170188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
15 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with USSR Deputy Foreign Minister I.A. Rogachev by correspondent V. Ivanov: "The Pacific: Hopes and Realities"; date and place not given]

[Text] [Ivanov] The Soviet National Committee for Asian and Pacific Economic Cooperation [SNCAPEC] was recently established in Moscow. Igor Alekseyevich, what dictated the need to set up such a committee? What are its aims and tasks?

[Rogachev] I wish, first of all, to recall M.S. Gorbachev's speech in Vladivostok in July 1986. In it the CPSU Central Committee general secretary raised the question of creating in the Soviet Far East a highly efficient national economic complex organically incorporated in the system of the all-union and international division of labor, with its own large-scale resource and science-and-production base, the optimum economic structure, and a developed social sphere. The Vladivostok speech formulated and outlined fundamentally new approaches to our policy in the Asia and Pacific region. One of the program's basic ideas is the active involvement of the Soviet Union—its Far Eastern regions above all—in the international division of labor and in cooperation in Asia and the Pacific basin. The recently created SNCAPEC is to be an important instrument in activating this process.

Some things have already been done. I cannot say that it is a great deal, but a start has been made. And that is the main thing. We have achieved, above all, an improvement in bilateral relations with the overwhelming majority of Asian and Pacific states. Our ties have deepened, broadened, and stabilized. Only recently we established diplomatic relations with a number of small island countries—Vanuatu, Fiji, Tonga, Papua New Guinea, Western Samoa, Nauru—and we intend to strengthen them in every possible way.

The totally new style of Soviet foreign policy is also helping in many ways to widen our diplomatic horizons. The principles of mutual respect, noninterference in each other's internal affairs, and observance of state sovereignty are being heard in a new way and being implemented in practice. Our approach to the states of the region is determined by the clearly expressed principle of nondetriment to relations between countries which are our partners and third states. For example, we want to expand contacts with Japan, let us say, but not at the expense of a deterioration in Japanese-U.S. ties.

[Ivanov] Commenting on the committee's formation, certain Western observers have pointed out that the Soviet Union has decided to shift its attention's center of gravity to regions of the Far East which previously were "treated as outcasts," since Moscow, it is said, is feverishly seeking ways to revive its economy, and Asian and Pacific countries present good potential opportunities for this....

[Rogachev] I cannot agree with such assertions. The construction of the Baykal-Amur Mainline Railroad, the construction of large-scale fuel and energy complexes in Siberia and the Far East, the presence of a strong fishing flotilla in the Pacific—these are just a few aspects of what has been done in past decades. We now intend to expand economic cooperation with Asian and Pacific countries, and we naturally expect the krays, oblasts, and rayons of our country adjacent to that region to play an active role in this connection. At the same time, we certainly are not shifting our attention's center of gravity

to the Far East to the detriment, say, of the western part of the union. We have simply begun devoting to this region precisely the attention which it rightly deserves.

[Ivanov] But was the necessary attention not devoted to Far Eastern regions before?

[Rogachev] Frankly speaking, no. Proper attention, unfortunately, was not devoted to them. But there were also objective factors which held up the development of cooperation. Thus, Soviet-Chinese relations, for example, were in point of fact frozen for more than 20 years. They have now received a new boost and are being broadened and deepened in many areas. Hence the need naturally arises to revive the ties which existed between the border regions of the USSR and China. The third session of the Soviet-Chinese Mixed Commission for Economic, Trade, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation was held in Beijing recently. Among other questions, the possibility of establishing and developing trade and economic ties between USSR union republics, ministries, departments, associations, and enterprises and PRC provinces, autonomous regions, and cities was also discussed there—which will, of course, give a boost to the reestablishment of ties between the two countries' border regions. This is just one example of the opening up of new opportunities. And there are others. We diplomats are working actively to open up more and more favorable new opportunities. And then everything will depend on their efficient utilization.

[Ivanov] In 1980 a number of Pacific states formed the Pacific Economic Cooperation Conference [PECC]. This is now an international forum representing more than 15 states. It resolves various questions connected with the trade and economic development of that region. Why is the Soviet Union still not one of its members?

[Rogachev] At first we were evidently guided by certain stereotypes that had long existed in our foreign policy, and we regarded the PECC as an attempt to create some grouping of an unfriendly nature. It was this—to put it bluntly—dogmatic approach that determined our attitude to the PECC virtually from the moment it was formed.

We are now restructuring our foreign policy and putting it on the rails of the new thinking. In this connection our approach to this international organization has also been reconsidered. We are ready to work within the PECC and to participate—and we already are participating—in its working commissions, for example, on fishing, energy, transport, mineral resources, and tourism.

[Ivanov] What is the PECC members' attitude to these intentions of the Soviet side?

[Rogachev] The organization's member countries include supporters and opponents of the idea of admitting the USSR to the PECC. Although those who are hindering the USSR's admission to the PECC are in the

minority, they recently showed initiative in adopting a decision under which the admission of new members to the PECC is temporarily halted. This step, incidentally, leaves outside the PECC framework certain states in the Asia and Pacific region, including Latin America, which also wish to join this organization.

[Ivanov] What dictated such a decision?

[Rogachev] Opponents of the Soviet Union's admission to the PECC believe that we will politicize the conference's activity and divert it from the economic tasks. Those claims are groundless and unfounded. I wish to repeat yet again that the Soviet Union regards work within the PECC as an opportunity to participate in the international division of labor in Asia and the Pacific and to extend the volume of its economic ties with all states of the region without exception.

[Ivanov] Nevertheless, we still remain on the sidelines, as it were, of Pacific economic cooperation, do we not?

[Rogachev] That is not quite right. The point is that even without official PECC membership it is possible to participate in the activities of its working commissions—which we do. In addition, a Soviet delegation headed by Academician Ye.M. Primakov, chairman of the SNCAPEC, recently participated in a PECC session in Osaka as a guest. And a Soviet representative was able for the first time to address one of the sittings. We consider this a positive step in the sphere of rapprochement with the PECC.

We have specific plans for establishing business contacts with other countries' PECC national committees. In July this year, for example, we expect our Australian colleagues to arrive in the country. Plans exist to hold one of the regular meetings of the working commissions on energy and raw materials on our territory. So practical work has begun.

[Ivanov] What role, in your view, could the SNCAPEC play in Pacific cooperation? Will its activity affect the economic development of Siberia and the Far East?

[Rogachev] It will undoubtedly affect it, and, I think, only positively. We are now examining options for actively involving the Far Eastern region in the system of the international division of labor. So the interest in the Soviet Far East on the part of business circles in Japan, China, Australia, the ASEAN countries, and other states of the region is perfectly justified. They have already submitted several mutually advantageous suggestions, which are now being examined. "Igirma-Tayriku" [name as published]—the first Soviet-Japanese joint timber production enterprise—has begun functioning.

At the end of July, a representative SNCAPEC delegation will visit the main regions of the Soviet Far East and, on this basis, will draw up specific proposals and recommendations for implementing plans for the radical

activation of foreign economic ties between our Far Eastern regions and the Asia and Pacific region. We must pass more quickly through the organizational stage and move on: make the transition from words and declarations to specific deeds.

Loginov on Arms, Regional Issues, Conference

*AU1706151888 Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish
9 Jun 88 p 4*

[Interview with Vadim Loginov, first deputy head of a department of the CPSU Central Committee, by Zygmunt Slomkowski in Warsaw: "The Achievements of the Moscow Summit"; date not given—first paragraph is TRYBUNA LUDU introduction]

[Text] Vadim Loginov, who as Mikhail Gorbachev's special envoy visited Warsaw to brief W. Jaruzelski on the U.S.-Soviet summit in Moscow, was interviewed on the premises of TRYBUNA LUDU about the summit, about the coming 19th CPSU Conference, and about M. Gorbachev's coming visit to Poland.

[Slomkowski] Discussing the Moscow summit, commentators stressed above all the completion of the INF accord process, some progress on disputed issues of a 50-percent reduction in offensive strategic weapons, and the continuation of the summit dialogue, which makes it possible to discuss problems of Soviet-U.S. relations and worldwide problems. Commentators also noted that there was no essential progress in negotiations on the 50-percent accord, SDI, and control over ships and planes capable of launching cruise missiles, and that differences in approach to local conflicts continued. I realize that this initial evaluation is not complete and that, as one of the participants in the summit, the USSR may take a different view of it.

[Loginov] This appraisal is generally correct but not quite accurate.

The summit's historic significance is that ratification documents concerning the accord on the elimination of two classes of nuclear missiles were exchanged. This is an extremely important event, and people will soon be able to witness the destruction of the most modern missiles. I stress: most modern and not obsolete nuclear missiles.

As for the negotiations on the accord on the 50-percent reduction in strategic missiles, agreements that are elements of this accord were signed: the agreement that obliges the sides to announce in advance that they intend to fire intercontinental missiles and submarine-launched missiles, which are the most dangerous strategic weapons. The two powers will inform each other where and when they intend to fire missiles for testing purposes. This helps to eliminate or almost eliminate an accidental outbreak of nuclear war.

It was also agreed that all nuclear missiles carried by planes and all planes that carry them will have to differ in appearance and specifications from cruise missiles equipped with conventional warheads and from the planes that are capable of carrying such cruise missiles.

[Slomkowski] Will it really be so easy to tell these missiles and planes apart?

[Loginov] These different types of hardware will be easy to identify visually or with the help of electronic devices. Take the old TU-104 and Boeing 737: They are completely different, although their principles are the same.

Agreement was also reached on controlling all offensive strategic missiles. This will be control over production, assembly, and deployment and will include on-site inspections.

On the other hand, two issues are still to be worked on. One concerns the linking of the accord under preparation to the accord on antimissile defense in the form in which it was signed in 1972. The sides agreed that the Washington formula on these interdependencies must be included in the accord on the 50-percent reduction in strategic weapons.

The other issue concerns control over cruise-type missiles launched at sea. The difficulty is that the Americans seek to exclude these missiles, which both sides possess, from control. If it was possible to agree on control over intercontinental missiles stationed at fixed bases, why should one refuse to agree on control over missiles based on ships? It is hard to understand this.

I would like to stress at this point that we will cooperate with the present U.S. Administration to the very end, and if the accord on the 50-percent reduction is ready, the fifth summit may be held in order to sign this accord. But if the accord cannot be completed for various reasons, a summit meeting would have no sense.

[Slomkowski] Let us talk about other issues.

[Loginov] Certainly. The Moscow talks have brought our two states closer to an accord on eliminating chemical weapons. We think that this will make it possible for the Geneva disarmament conference, which continues to negotiate an appropriate convention, to accelerate its work.

As for limiting armed forces and armaments in Europe between the Atlantic and the Urals, the two sides also came closer to agreement during their Moscow talks. That is why we think that this progress made in Moscow will help open negotiations between the 23 members of the Warsaw Pact and NATO. We presented a three-stage program for limiting armed forces and armaments in Europe. This program is based on the Warsaw Pact draft program that was adopted in Budapest, and that includes recent proposals such as the Jaruzelski Plan, the concept

of a nuclear-free corridor proposed by the GDR, Czechoslovakia, and the SPD in West Germany, the Jakes initiative, and so on. We think that on the basis of this it is possible to rapidly begin negotiations, which is made easier by the fact that the issue of control, which has created so many difficulties, has now acquired a completely new form. We are in favor of extensive and complete control. We think that not all NATO members want to go that far.

[Slomkowski] But the thing is that the West is seeking to obtain bigger reductions in the Warsaw Pact armaments than in NATO armaments....

[Loginov] We have proposed that there should be an exchange of data about the state of armed forces and armaments between the Atlantic and the Urals and that this should be followed by the mutual verification of this data so that real asymmetries can be revealed. And if anyone possesses larger quantities of some hardware—if, say, NATO possesses more tactical planes and we possess more tanks, then this hardware should be reduced to the same level.

[Slomkowski] But NATO is still refusing to accept such a solution.

[Loginov] Precisely. The West is still not ready. It is only ready to exchange data during negotiations, but not publicly. Nor is it ready to have this data verified. We still have to do more work on this issue. It is a collective issue, of course. Agreement on it has already been reached within the Warsaw Pact, but not within NATO. Of course, these are questions of each state's national security. These questions are not plain sailing, and that is why we do not expect to receive a positive answer overnight. We have to get down to more work, but the crux of the matter is precisely the fact that it is necessary to verify this data. As for the second phase, the task is to radically reduce armed forces and armaments so that, as Comrade Jaruzelski proposes, both sides give up their offensive armed potential at long last.

[Slomkowski] Regional problems took up much time during the Moscow summit.

[Loginov] These were difficult problems, and it cannot be said that we made significant progress on them. Objective difficulties are involved. The USSR and the United States can only cooperate on reaching settlements or can try to interfere in them as little as possible. Following Afghanistan, such solutions continue to mature in Cambodia and in Central America. If no outsider interfered in such conflicts and, better, if we could have constructive cooperation to solve them, solutions would follow more swiftly. At present, the Americans are not ready for this approach, although their position vis-a-vis the Afghanistan question was realistic.

[Slomkowski] A number of hotbeds of local conflicts are still there. Following Afghanistan, which of them could be extinguished most speedily?

[Loginov] I assume that the conflicts in the south of Africa could be extinguished most speedily.

[Slomkowski] I have just returned from Kabul. People there are disturbed by the fact that the Geneva accords continue to be clearly violated, that is, that Pakistan and the United States continue to intervene in Afghanistan.

[Loginov] I think that life itself will ensure that those accords are observed, that it will compel Pakistan to observe them. If Pakistan were satisfied with the situation, its president would not have dismissed the government and dissolved the parliament. It is difficult for me to say when interference will stop, but the thing is that is not in Pakistan's interest to prolong the war. After all, the alliance of the Afghan opposition forces in Pakistan continues to interfere in Pakistan's internal affairs, and the population of Peshawar and of the border areas has now become tired. We know how many armed clashes there have been between Pakistani tribes in the border areas and the Afghan insurgents. I think that large areas of Pakistan want to live under more peaceful conditions.

[Slomkowski] What about the impact of the summit on Soviet-U.S. relations?

[Loginov] Progress was made in all spheres, except the economic sphere. As Mikhail Gorbachev said, we have learned to live without each other, and that is why we should also learn how to cooperate. We have little trade with the United States, and economic ties with it are almost nonexistent, but we know that U.S. business is seeking to develop relations with our country and wishes to do more than just to rely on Armand Hammer. The recent session of the Soviet-American Council was attended by representatives from over 500 U.S. firms. Unfortunately, the restrictions imposed by the administration and Congress are still in force. Our economic relations will not develop as long as these restrictions stay in force. Well, we will manage without this development, although we would like to develop economic relations because they would create permanent infrastructure in all areas. After all, developed economic links mean that war confrontation has been halted, because specific interests of business are at stake.

On the other hand, everything is quite promising in the area of culture, art, education, and science. We have resumed the old cooperation in the field of space and have begun to cooperate on ecology, the protection of the ozone zone, and so on. This is just normal cooperation, in which our two societies are most deeply interested.

[Slomkowski] This cooperation also creates conditions under which to improve the climate of mutual trust.

[Loginov] This is undoubtedly so. In any case, we have such hopes.

[Slomkowski] The Moscow summit is now over, but the Soviet capital will be the setting for another event of enormous importance, one that is of more than just domestic significance. I am thinking of the upcoming 19th party conference. We know from the Theses that the conference has been set the task of defining the course of restructuring more precisely, of making it embrace the entire party, and giving concrete form to tasks in all areas of life. We also know that the conference will meet at a time when problems are emerging in the resolution of concrete problems and at a time when many doubts have been raised.

[Loginov] This is a time of very stormy processes in the country and the party. A critical appraisal is being made of the road that has been travelled over the last 70 years by the USSR and its vanguard, of the difficult path that the party has travelled in creating a new, socialist society.

Of course, there were difficult times: the attempts to destroy the young worker-peasant state, the effects of capitalist encirclement, and World War II. Mistakes of a subjective nature were also made domestically. All this means that socialism in our country does not possess an ideal character. There are various reasons for this. We are now witnessing a tendency to attribute everything to one person. History is more complicated than that. It ought to be remembered that what is of the greatest importance for socialism is the lot of the working man, who ought to be the master of his own life and should take part in the running of the country and derive benefits from doing so. The current interests of working people cannot be sacrificed for some distant goals. That is the basic conclusion that the party has drawn from its analysis of the history of the last 70 years.

The key is the democratization of all areas of our public and party life. Man is at the center. This means that we have to take a look at what forces are constrained, what forces have been bureaucratized, and at how these obstacles can be removed so as to release people's initiative. This calls for changes in the political system and the superstructure. This is the main issue that is being discussed on the eve of the conference, and not just in the party but by all of society. It has never happened in the past that during the selection of delegates for a conference even people who are not party members have nominated candidates. People are preparing memorials and even organizing demonstrations in support of restructuring activists and against those who are displaying a lack of involvement or are delaying restructuring processes. So I think that the composition of the delegates will be extraordinary and that the delegates will be able to reach agreement about how to reorganize the social structure and create a structure that will release people's initiative.

[Slomkowski] Could it be said that if a program for economic restructuring was the result of the 27th Congress, then the focus of attention at the conference will be on the restructuring of the superstructure?

[Loginov] I would not put it that way. The 27th Congress formulated a long-term party program for all areas: politics, economics, foreign affairs, culture, education, ideology, and defense. I would say that what this conference will focus on are methods of implementing the program.

[Slomkowski] In all areas?

[Loginov] Precisely, as people's problems are what matter most of all. It is a question of realizing in practical terms the socialist slogan: from each according to his ability, to each according to his work. Well, distribution according to work is somehow being achieved, but there are still many instances of wage leveling. But the call for "from each according to his ability" means that there should be greater interest in more efficient work.

The method used to achieve this is democratization. If we take a look at recent legislation, such as the law on the socialist enterprise, the law on cooperatives, and the law on individual activity—they all contain democratic principles. The time has now come for the entire social mechanism to serve more effective and more useful needs.

[Slomkowski] We already have the experience of Hungary, where the failure of political reforms to keep up with economic reforms had negative repercussions. We in Poland are also aware of how the two are linked. Is this also being noted in the Soviet Union?

[Loginov] Of course, you cannot have some traffic keeping to the right when the general rule is that it keeps to the left. You cannot have economic reforms without democratic changes. Actions have to be taken in tandem. We started with the reform of the economy, and we became aware of the fact that by itself it is not enough to make people very eager to work, to expose all the possible incentives. Agitation by itself is not enough.

[Slomkowski] What, in your opinion, are the most important and most interesting aspects of the concrete proposals contained in the preconference Theses? To my mind, for example, although it is not perhaps the most important aspect, the suggestion that posts in the party and state apparatus should only be held for a limited time is extremely significant. After all, it practically transforms the character of the party and state apparatus.

[Loginov] To my mind, the most important aspect is the transfer of power to soviets and employee representative and social organs.

It is not a simple matter. The situation that has existed until now, one in which the party is identified with the executive branch of authority, is the product of many different subjective, objective, and historical factors. However, the party is not the same as authority in this sense. The party is the vanguard, the force that formulates strategy. But the strategy that it formulates must be accepted by the people. If it is not accepted, then it will fail to produce results. This is because power belongs to the working people and is for the working people.

[Slomkowski] We only have 2 weeks to go before the CPSU general secretary visits Poland. We have played host to Mikhail Gorbachev before, but this is his first official visit to Poland. The visit will sum up achievements in our relations, which have developed so dramatically in recent years and have reached qualitatively new levels. It will set out new prospects for cooperation, which will call for work aimed at acceleration or urgent solutions.

[Loginov] Our cooperation in the foreign policy field is very good, just as it is in the defense field. Over the last 2 years, particularly after the signing of the joint declaration on cooperation in ideology, culture, and learning, there has been a very rapid expansion of cooperation in the superstructure field, including personnel exchanges. A joint commission of historians has been established; this is very important for freeing us from various complexes that still exist. A great deal has been achieved in border region cooperation. However, there is an area in which cooperation ought to develop better, that is, the economic and scientific and technical spheres.

[Slomkowski] There are programs....

[Loginov] There are programs, but they are being implemented too slowly. We only have one joint enterprise so far. It is strange that cooperation with capitalist enterprises—in our country and in yours—works straight away. This is still not the case among socialist countries. Evidently, we still have not worked out the right model for cooperation. We have to set in motion incentive mechanisms that would enable our enterprises to operate on the basis of mutual economic interest. I think that this will happen. New conditions are being created in our country: Enterprises have received the right to establish direct contacts with foreign partners. There is no longer a need to go a ministry or to Gosplan, which was the case in the past. A system for seeking out partners has to be found. Until now partners were imposed from above. It should be a natural process based on economic factors or needs.

[Slomkowski] Thank you very much.

Demichev Attends Nuclear-Free Zones Meeting

Seen Off by Talyzin

LD1906225188 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1430 GMT 19 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A Soviet delegation led by Petr Demichev, alternate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first vice president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, has left Moscow for Berlin today to attend the international meeting in support of nuclear-free zones. The delegation was seen off at the airport by Comrade Talyzin, Mokanu, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and other officials. Among those in the seeing-off party was Koenig, the GDR ambassador to the USSR.

Arrives in Berlin

LD1906218588 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1630 GMT 19 Jun 88

[Text] A Soviet delegation headed by Comrade Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, arrived in Berlin on 19 June to take part in an international meeting in support of nuclear-free zones.

Hager, Politburo member and SED Central Committee Secretary, and other officials greeted the delegation at the airport. Among the welcoming party was Kochemassov, the USSR's ambassador to the GDR.

Addresses Meeting

LD2006163788 Moscow TASS in English 1620 GMT
20 Jun 88

[Text] Berlin June 20 TASS—An international meeting for the creation of nuclear-free zones opened in the Palace of the Republic in Berlin today. The meeting is convened at the initiative of the GDR.

Addressing the meeting, Petr Demichev, alternate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, who leads the Soviet delegation, said that in today's conditions a nuclear-free zone is a real step toward implementing the idea of a non-offensive military doctrine. At present, proposals to establish nuclear-free zones assume added topicality as another important avenue for ridding Europe of nuclear weapons, where the process of liquidating those weapons has already begun.

In the opinion of the USSR, there are all the necessary grounds for passing over to a practical implementation of the proposals concerning a nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe, including a nuclear-free status for the

waters of the Baltic Sea and implementation of corresponding measures on territory contiguous to the future nuclear-free zone, including Soviet territory.

We believe that the Balkan states would feel more confident and calm if the proposals of Bulgaria and Romania to make that area a zone with neither nuclear nor chemical weapons were implemented.

Our plans, the head of the Soviet delegation says, are not confined solely to Europe. The Soviet Union, as you know, has been persistently working for ensuring reliable security in the Asia-Pacific region, in the zone of the Indian Ocean, and putting forward relevant constructive proposals for ending hostilities in the Near and Middle East, in the Persian Gulf area, in the south of Africa, and in Central America. The accords reached on Afghanistan are a good example for eliminating other pockets of tensions.

We firmly abide by the main principle of the new political thinking that neither nuclear war nor nuclear weapons can be a means for attaining any political objectives whatsoever. The understanding of security as a priority and urgent task for the whole of humankind, as a quest for a balance of the legitimate interests of the peoples through exclusion of war from the life of mankind, as the creation of a nuclear-free and non-violent world—this is the only path of survival, of solving global problems facing mankind today.

We believe that the time has come for the assertion of non-military guarantees of universal security, for the adoption by states of a defensive strategy and of the principle of sufficiency for the defence. We propose the starting of reductions in conventional arms with eliminating the existing imbalances and asymmetries on the basis of a mutual exchange of data and their verification, and the setting of the task to liquidate foreign military presence and military bases in foreign territories by the year 2000. We are prepared to participate in the establishment, under the U.N. aegis, of an international agency for disarmament supervision and control. And, naturally, one of the major tasks is to prevent the appearance of arms in space, pollution of space. We are for making real progress in banning nuclear tests, Petr Demichev said.

Gorbachev Greets Forum

PM2006101088 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
20 Jun 88 Second Edition p 1

[Message from M. Gorbachev: "To the Participants in the International Meeting for Nuclear-Free Zones"]

[Text] Please accept best wishes on the start of your meeting.

The historic Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles has come into force. The pace must not slacken; it is necessary to advance dynamically in the direction it outlines.

The Soviet Union is entirely prepared—and as soon as possible—together with other countries possessing nuclear weapons, to eliminate its status as a nuclear power. And while we still have that status, we are prepared for radical limitations on its practical manifestations. That includes support for the creation of nuclear-free zones and the granting of corresponding guarantees to the states participating in them.

The value of nuclear-free zones is that they can help to narrow the sphere of nuclear preparations, separate the nuclear forces of the opposing alliances, and thereby lessen the risk of nuclear conflict. Their creation develops international trust, promotes stability in relations between the nuclear powers, and strengthens the regime of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

I am confident that your international meeting will give new impetus to this process.

M. Gorbachev.

Gerasimov Holds Foreign Ministry Briefing 17 Jun

Cites Pakistani Violations

LD1706132588 Moscow TASS in English 1313 GMT
17 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 17 TASS—"Instead of taking effective measures to terminate interference in Afghanistan's affairs Islamabad is resorting to all sorts of subterfuges making it impossible for the United Nations observers to carry out their control and inspection functions", a press briefing here today was told by the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov.

In this connection the head of the ministry's Information Directorate cited the following fact: When United Nations observers travelled on June 4-6 to the area of the towns of Parachinar and Peshawar to investigate complaints made by Afghanistan, they were barred by the Pakistani authorities from visiting the localities that were named in the Afghan Foreign Ministry's notes as staging areas for caravans supplying arms to the antigovernment groupings in Afghanistan. "This contradicts Pakistan's undertaking to give full support and cooperation to the entire personnel of the United Nations Good Offices Mission when it discharges its functions on Pakistani territory", Gennadiy Gerasimov stressed.

Pakistan admits, he said, that it is not restricting the activity of the headquarters of the "Alliance of Seven" which is the organiser and instigator of hostilities by Afghan anti-government formations. This too is a flagrant violation of the provisions of the Geneva accords, he went on.

Such facts show that to this day Islamabad has not drawn proper conclusions about the need to undeviatingly implement the Geneva agreements. "Responsibility for these violations rests with the Pakistani leadership which should be well aware of the extent of the negative consequences with which violations of the Geneva accords are fraught not only for the settlement of the Afghan problem but also for the cause of peace and security in the entire region", the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said in conclusion.

Shultz Adviser Criticized

PM1906165988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
19 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent G. Charodeyev report: "Violating the Geneva Accords. From Our Correspondent at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Text] Addressing Soviet and foreign journalists at a routine briefing, G. Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, touched on the question of the fulfillment of the Geneva accords on Afghanistan.

Recently, he said, the Soviet Union and the Republic of Afghanistan have repeatedly noted instances of Pakistani violations of the Geneva accords. Corresponding warnings have been given. It should be noted that sociopolitical circles within Pakistan itself are publicly reflecting serious concern in this connection. At a Peshawar press conference Yusuf Hussain, leader of the movement for the unification of the Pushtun tribes, recently pointed out that the "wrecking of the Geneva accords will lead not only to a bloody civil war in Afghanistan, but to the involvement of Pakistan, with catastrophic consequences."

Instead of taking effective measures to end interference in Afghan affairs, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman stressed, Pakistan is resorting to various ruses which make it essentially impossible for the UN observers to carry out their control and inspection functions. Here is just one example: During a 4-6 June trip by UN observers to the region of the cities of Parachinar and Peshawar in order to investigate complaints from Afghanistan, the Pakistani authorities prevented them from visiting the areas where weapons caravans for the antigovernment groupings in Afghanistan are formed up. This directly contravenes the commitments adopted by Pakistan to fully support the entire personnel of the UN good offices mission.

Z. Khalilzad, special adviser to the U.S. secretary of state, claims that he does not believe that Pakistan is violating the Geneva accords. On the other hand, the U.S. diplomat believes in and is convincing others of the existence of a threat to Pakistan from the USSR. Well, if

there is such a Soviet threat, this accounts for his assurances of U.S. support for Pakistan. This in practice means an increase in U.S. military aid to the Afghan opposition.

The Soviet Union, G. Gerasimov stressed, does not threaten Pakistan. Afghanistan does not threaten Pakistan. But both our countries demand that Islamabad fulfill its commitments under the Geneva accords.

Condemns Writer on Palestinians

LD1706203288 Kuwait KUNA in English 1950 GMT
17 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow, June 17 (KUNA)—The Soviet Foreign Ministry Friday described as "irresponsible" a statement by a Soviet writer labeling Palestinians as terrorists, reiterating the firm Soviet stance in support of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people.

During a press briefing today, the Foreign Ministry spokesman said that neither the official Soviet circles nor the world public opinion compare the just struggle of the Palestinians for fulfillment of their legitimate rights, to terrorism.

He was replying to a petition raised by the PLO office in Moscow and other pro-Palestinian student groupings demanding official Soviet comment on the branding of the Palestinians as terrorists by a Soviet writer.

The Soviet writer Mikhail Zadornov, while introducing the Miss Moscow contest on the Soviet television two weeks ago, said the Palestinian terrorists use the Soviet television because of its great impact.

The Foreign Ministry spokesman said the statement of the Soviet writer was irresponsible affirming the Soviet Union had always supported the just struggle of the Palestinians including their right to self-determination.

Hails Vietnamese Withdrawal

LD1706125288 Moscow TASS in English 1235 GMT
17 Jun 88

Moscow June 17 TASS—A Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman today hailed the decision of Vietnam and Kampuchea to return 50,000 Vietnamese volunteers home from the latter country this year as further evidence of the two nations' desire to settle the regional conflict in South East Asia and lift military tension there.

Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the ministry's Information Directorate, was speaking at a news briefing here today.

Quoting reports from Hanoi and Phnom Penh, he told the attending reporters that the withdrawal of Vietnamese volunteers, their command and logistic support services will be carried out as early as this month.

Kampuchea and Vietnam, he said, have expressed readiness to receive observers from governments, international organizations and all those showing an interest in the Kampuchean problem to monitor the partial troop pullout this year.

Backs Polish Arms Initiative

LD1706124488 Moscow TASS in English 1200 GMT
17 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 17 TASS—A Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman today voiced complete backing for the so-called Jaruzelski Peace Plan and the latest Polish Government proposals as geared to improving the military-political situation in Europe and furthering the process of disarmament.

Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the ministry's Information Directorate, was speaking at a news briefing here today.

The latest Polish proposals of June 14, following up on the Jaruzelski Plan of May 8, 1987, call for a series of specific steps towards nuclear disarmament, cuts in conventional arms and armed forces, moves to reduce the possibility of a surprise attack, and other confidence- and security-building measures in Europe.

"The Polish initiative for cutting back arms and strengthening trust in central Europe will facilitate a concrete dialogue between East and West to reach mutually acceptable agreements to scale down military confrontation in Europe, enhance security in the continent and advance the CSCE (Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe) process," Gerasimov said.

Further on Gerasimov 13 Jun News Briefing
PM1706161988 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY
in Russian No 25, 18-24 Jun 88 (Signed to Press
16 Jun 88) p 8

[Unattributed report: "At the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Text] At a routine briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists, G. Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, announced that the Pakistani ambassador to the USSR was recently handed a USSR Foreign Ministry note in connection with the Pakistani side's violations of its commitments on noninterference in Afghanistan's internal affairs. It has to be said that since the very first days of the Geneva agreements' entry into force the Pakistani side has not only not adopted measures to curtail interference but has been encouraging it; what is more, statements of that kind have been made at the highest level. The withdrawal of Soviet forces, G. Gerasimov stressed, is continuing in accordance with the agreed timetable and

proportions, but, as the note stresses, there cannot be a situation wherein some of the commitments assumed by the Soviet and Afghan sides are implemented, while others are ignored.

Journalists' questions were then answered.

[Question] What can you report about a visit to the USSR by an Israeli consular delegation? (SANA)

G. Gerasimov: The question is being considered. They have not received visas yet.

[Question] Has B. Yeltsin been elected a delegate to the 19th party conference? (AP)

G. Gerasimov: Yes, he has been elected a delegate for the Karelian Autonomous Republic.

[Question] Has Mr Gorbachev been able to see the BBC interview with Boris Yeltsin and what are his conclusions? (LIBERATION)

G. Gerasimov: I do not have that information.

[Question] Recently there have been new reports in the Swedish media about Soviet submarines off the Swedish coast. What can you say about this? (Moscow Radio)

G. Gerasimov: Searching for submarines is the Swedish Armed Forces' favorite occupation. I can say that we do not have submarines in Swedish territorial waters. It is all rather mystifying—I read that the Swedes had allegedly launched depth charges and badly damaged a submarine.

It is reminiscent of the search for the Loch Ness monster—evidently it has moved to the shores of Sweden. I want to wish the Swedish navy success in its quest for a new unidentified underwater object.

At the 13 June briefing, G. Gerasimov also announced that on 12 June a group of citizens gathered at Vagankovskoye Cemetery in Moscow. Again they were discussing the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh. Someone dashed into the crowd: "Two Armenians have been killed in Baku!" Disturbed by the news, people moved to the TASS building to protest the "concealment of information," as they put it. This unsanctioned rally in the square in front of the Timiryazev monument, a square filled with Muscovites on holiday, took place without any consequences, in particular as far as the participants were concerned, thanks to the restraint and patience of the police. The foreign correspondents who were present would vouch for that. The next day Baku told us that the information about the killing of Armenians had been false. What actually happened in Baku on 11 June is the following: During a demonstration someone fired a hunting rifle from a window of an apartment block. The bullet ricocheted and hit Militia Sergeant Ismailov, born in 1951. He died the next day. The person who fired the

shot has been identified. Weapons, including hunting weapons, kill people irrespective of nationality. There will be an investigation to establish the motive behind the criminal's action.

The situation in Yerevan is difficult. On Sunday, in Theater Square, there was a rally calling for a strike to last until 15 June—an Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet session started that day.

Reports on food supplies for the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast have appeared in the local press in Baku. In the first 5 months of this year the oblast was supplied with more food than in the same period last year. For example: 809 tonnes of meat and poultry were supplied, last year's figure being 770 tonnes; the figures for cheese are 244 and 192 tonnes respectively; for flour—8,400 and 7,400 tonnes; for sugar—2,326 and 2,057 tonnes. It is true that stocks of butter and eggs have dwindled somewhat, but this is due to a shortfall in the oblast's own deliveries. But it is now difficult to obtain food products because these stocks are not being drawn on by trade outlets since stores are closed, while in many cases vehicles carrying consignments of food have not been unloaded.

Foreign Leaders Briefed by Special Envoys
PM2106084188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Soviet Representatives' Briefings"]

[Text] President Saddam Husayn of Iraq has received special envoy M.D. Sytenko. During the conversation the Iraqi leader made a high assessment of the Moscow summit, stressing that the whole world—and that includes Iraq—welcomes the results of the summit and sees it as a major contribution to the cause of strengthening international security and preventing a world thermonuclear catastrophe.

Mexican Foreign Minister Bernardo Sepulveda had a meeting with special envoy V.B. Lomeyko. On behalf of the Mexican Government the minister welcomed the results of the Moscow summit, stressing its particular importance for the further development of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue in the interests of ensuring international security.

Irish Prime Minister Charles Haughey has received special envoy O.A. Grinevskiy. We view the Moscow summit, the prime minister stated, as a major international event which has given new impetus to the normalization of Soviet-U.S. relations. Ireland, he stressed, welcomes the efforts of the Soviet and U.S. leaders in disarmament.

In a talk with envoy V.M. Vasev, chief of a USSR Foreign Ministry department, Mozambican Foreign Minister P. Mocumbi described the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan as a historic stage in the development of relations between the two powers.

CSCE Delegation Holds Vienna News Conference
LD1706172888 Moscow TASS in English 1528 GMT
17 Jun 88

[Text] Vienna June 17 TASS—The leader of the Soviet delegation to the Vienna followup meeting of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Yuriy Kashlev, delegation member Major-General V. Tatarnikov, A. Kokoshin, a corresponding member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, and Professor V. Kremenyuk gave a news conference here today on the Soviet approach to cuts in armed forces and conventional armaments.

They set forth the Soviet concept of non-offensive strategy and sufficiency and offered the latest ideas of Soviet scientists on this score.

The speakers also explained the main points of a memorandum on how security can be achieved through disarmament, which has been submitted by a group of socialist countries to the U.N. General Assembly's third special session on disarmament, and which affirms new notions about a reasonable blend and harmony of national and general security.

The Soviet representatives gave special attention to issues related to a mandate for future talks on the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals and explained a recent Soviet proposal for holding these negotiations phase by phase.

They stressed the Soviet Union's readiness to agree to reciprocal cuts in all kinds of offensive weapons, including tactical nuclear arms, strike aircraft and tanks.

Petrovskiy Holds News Conference at UN 17 Jun
PM1906170388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Enhancing the Role of the United Nations"]

[Text] New York, 17 Jun—V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, has held a news conference at UN headquarters devoted to the place and role of the United Nations in the formulation of a comprehensive system of peace and security.

On the basis of the enhancement of the role of the United Nations he proposed implementing a number of specific measures.

With a view to intensifying the nuclear disarmament process and achieving nuclear disarmament by the year 2000, a Security Council session should be convened at the foreign minister level, and the Geneva Disarmament Conference should be involved in the examination of this problem.

We are ridding our policy with regard to the United Nations of dogma and a subjective approach. We are entitled to expect the same self-criticism, responsibility, and reasonable approach from other states too, V.F. Petrovskiy stressed.

Linnik Praises Outcome of UN Disarmament Debate
LD1606133088 Moscow TASS in English 0809 GMT
16 Jun 88

Moscow June 16 TASS—The debate on some crucial issues such as reducing nuclear arsenals and banning chemical weapons at the U.N. General Assembly's third special session on disarmament "has demonstrated an immeasurably greater uniformity of views than the previous second special session on disarmament", Viktor Linnik, PRAVDA's New York correspondent, writes today.

"The standpoints of the majority of the participants in the discussion on banning nuclear weapon tests are drawing closer. The doctrine of nuclear deterrence incurred a sharper criticism".

The correspondent points out that the ideas aired in the speech by the head of the Soviet delegation Eduard Shevardnadze drew a positive response from many states. This applies, in part, to such issues as the race in naval armaments and space militarization. By the way, the United States allies—West Germany, the Netherlands and Italy—supported the USSR's stance.

"Developing countries, which are being drawn on an increasingly greater scale into the arms race and, accordingly, into poverty and which earlier were invulnerable to criticism, came under impartial fire during the debates. This is exactly why, in my opinion, the exchange of views on the topic 'Disarmament and Development' was not distinguished by a keen and productive nature", Viktor Linnik went on.

Regrettably, the Soviet proposal for phasing out foreign military bases and foreign military presence by the year 2000 failed to draw a keen response. But on the whole, the balance of good and bad news from the session tips in favour of the first. The conviction that the efforts by the USSR and the United States in the field of disarmament should be complemented by multilateral actions has become common.

Vorontsov Receives World Muslim Congress Head
*LD1706141888 Moscow TASS in English 1225 GMT
17 Jun 88*

[Text] Moscow June 17 TASS—Yuliy Vorontsov, the first deputy foreign minister of the USSR, today received Inamullah Khan, general secretary of the World Muslim Congress, who is staying in the USSR for the celebrations marking the 1,000 anniversary of Christianity in Russia.

Much attention was paid during the conversation to the problem of deblocking regional conflicts, in particular to the progress of Afghan settlement. It was stressed that it can be successfully completed only if all parties to the Geneva agreements strictly observe them.

Inamullah Khan completely agreed with such an approach. Having stressed that the World Muslim Congress supported the Geneva agreements, he said that the leadership of the organisation did everything possible to promote the peaceful settlement of the foreign and domestic aspects of the Afghan problem.

In reply to an issue raised by Yuliy Vorontsov, Inamullah Khan promised to take all necessary measures to promote the earliest release and return home of Soviet servicemen who are on the territory of Pakistan.

The conversation passed in a friendly atmosphere.

United States & Canada

Former CIA Employee Edward Howard Interviewed

LD1806001388 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1635 GMT on 17 June is observed in progress carrying a special unscheduled program entitled "Two Meetings With Edward Howard." A man identified as Edward Howard is seen seated in a studio with an unidentified interviewer watching a monitor on which is being shown a video clip of Howard giving an interview. In the video clip, Howard, speaking in English with superimposed Russian translation, says the following:

"Before I began working for the CIA, I had been brought up in a spirit of being responsible for my own actions. But in the CIA, it was made clear to me from the start that initiative was not welcomed. The most important thing there was the ability to carry out orders, whether you liked the policy or not. That is what is valued above all. The whole atmosphere there is imbued with a militaristic spirit. I did not like that atmosphere, and finally, in June 1983, all this led to my leaving the CIA after I had failed to pass the latest lie detector test. I was tested four times, and they kept refusing to believe me, in the belief that I was concealing some kind of criminal acts. I was emotionally exhausted. I found it a degrading procedure because my personal worth was called into question by an electronic machine. The machine judged what sort of person I was. I said everything bad about myself that I could—how I spat on the sidewalk and broke traffic regulations. But they were not satisfied; they believed that I was hiding something and demanded that I tell them everything. So I left, and I felt much better after that."

Video then cuts to scenes at CIA headquarters in Langley, the CIA emblem, and people operating printers and computer tapes, while an unidentified announcer says that what is known about the CIA is "just the tip of a monstrous iceberg." Over 18,000 people work at the "USA's main espionage and terrorism department" today. Listing some operations conducted by the CIA in recent years, "including the period when Edward Howard was being trained in the Soviet sector," the announcer says the CIA has supported antigovernment actions in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Ethiopia, and Angola. He says the undeclared war in Afghanistan has already cost the CIA almost \$2 billion, and adds: "In the Near and Middle East, the CIA is trying to get rid of Khomeini and Al-Qadhdhafi and to impose U.S. influence on Iran and Libya." The bombing of Libya in 1986 and the Iran-contra affair are then recalled, while video shows a building interior, a sign saying "CIA Operations Center", a CIA "Career Opportunities" pamphlet, guerrillas in action in Afghanistan, shots of Khomeini and Al-Qadhdhafi, and air-raid damage in Libya.

Over video of Nicaraguan President Ortega and a burning oil facility, the announcer says attempts to topple the Sandinist government in Nicaragua are continuing. Over shots of police and ambulances in an Italian street, the announcer says: "In Italy, a new secret service network—a super-CIA—is being set up. It is a top secret organization, to operate in parallel with the official CIA structure. It is to specialize in secret operations known only to the director of the CIA. One of them involves the use of \$2 million from Saudi Arabia to prevent the Communist Party from beating the Christian Democrats in the 1985 election."

Over video of the assassination attempt against the pope and shots of Mehmet Ali Agca and Antonov in the dock, the announcer says the CIA tried to implicate the socialist countries in international terrorism. Bob Woodward's book on the CIA's activities during 1981-87 is cited as saying that the CIA gathers intelligence data worldwide. Video then shows aerial shots of the CIA's Langley headquarters, an antenna facility, and of soldiers training.

Back in the studio, the monitor goes blank, and Howard talks with the unidentified interviewer.

"[Interviewer] Ed, this is my first question. Why did you decide to come here to Moscow, to the Soviet Union?"

"[Howard] A lot of time has passed since I gave the interview that you saw—a little more than a year and a half. In that period, I have been thinking a lot about why I broke with the CIA and what happened to me in general. One thing is clear to me: I came to the Soviet Union because I was being pursued by a mighty organization. I lived for almost a year hiding from everybody—I lived illegally. After that year, I was physically and emotionally not in very good shape. It was then that I came to the conclusion that I needed help. I wanted to lead a normal life. I wanted to walk down the street like a normal person, and to have friends and a job. I knew that the Soviet Union was possibly the only force in the world that could resist the CIA and tell it: 'Leave this man alone; let him live in peace.' That is what happened."

"[Interviewer] What sort of reception did you get here?"

"[Howard] Very warm. Your people were surprised at my sudden appearance. At first they naturally did not know what to do about this strange turn of events, this strange person. But then they immediately offered me protection, a refuge, food and medical facilities. After a few days, they began to have a better understanding of me and the situation I found myself in—what I wanted and needed. And they took care of me. I gave the interview roughly 2 months after I found myself in the Soviet Union."

"[Interviewer] Ed, before our interview I took a look at the Western papers from that period. They said that the KGB interrogated you under torture and treated you roughly.

"[Howard] That is not true. I have never been interrogated under torture in the Soviet Union. My only problem here is that I had to pay a fine to the state automobile inspectorate when I accidentally exceeded the speed limit, changed lanes improperly, or something of that sort.

"[Interviewer] I understand your problems. I'm a driver myself. But they also say that you are held in isolation, that you are all but in prison. Are you free to travel around the Soviet Union and to move around Moscow?

"[Howard] Yes, I am free. I travel around Moscow a lot. Not only have I been to other cities, but also to the socialist countries. I went there after getting a visa like anybody else. Generally, I can do anything I feel like. I have no complaints.

"[Interviewer] Before the interview, when we were discussing our meeting, you said that you knew how to shoot video film. And you said that you had a cassette showing your travels. I asked you to bring it. Could we take a look at it now?

"[Howard] Yes, go ahead. Only, of course, the film isn't professional. But there may be something of interest.

"[Interviewer] I think there will be. While we are looking, could you give us a brief commentary on what's happening?

"[Howard] This is Tallinn airport, where we landed. We then went to the Viru Hotel. [video shows Howard in a parking lot]

"[Interviewer] Who is the cameraman?

"[Howard] The cameraman is a friend of mine. We flew from Moscow together. And this is the cathedral. In every city I go to, I always seek out the most interesting architecture. I like ancient churches, the rooftops of Tallinn. [video shows a church and a view of rooftops]

"[Interviewer] You look happy here. You are laughing.

"[Howard] Yes, I had a good time there. I must say I was a little overweight, and I'm glad I've now lost 10 kg. Next, tennis. I often try to play tennis. And this is the riverbank. And this is a parade of old cars. It's a beautiful town. I got to like the people very much. This is the memorial to the dead of World War II. I made this film for my family, to send to America. I want them to know a little more about the Soviet Union. [video shows a tennis game, vintage cars, war memorial]

"[Interviewer] Is this Moscow?

"[Howard] Yes, I'm in Moscow now. We took these shots a little after Tallinn, so I haven't got my moustache. In Red Square. I like St Basil's Cathedral very much; it's very beautiful. [video shows Howard beside Kremlin and St Basil's]

"Generally speaking, Moscow has been very warm. I expected it to be colder. Red Square is always beautiful. I like to go there in the evening when it is illuminated by lights. And this is the Catholic Church of St Louis. I go to it when I'm in Moscow.

"[Interviewer] Do you visit the church frequently?

"[Howard] I go there on Sundays to hear mass. I am a Catholic, and for me it's very pleasing. [video shows church exterior]

"[Interviewer] Ed, perhaps you could say a little about your impressions of the other cities you have been to. Leningrad, for instance.

"[Howard] Oh, Leningrad! A wonderful city. I have been there three times, and each time I have enjoyed it more. I could spend days on end in the Russian museum and the Hermitage. I have also been to Kiev, Tbilisi, and Georgia. I was interested to look around the Stalin museum in Gori. Then there is Vladimir. I have been around Russia's golden ring and visited other parts of the Soviet Union, as indeed many cities in the socialist countries. At present, my Russian is not very good because I have spent 6 months outside the Soviet Union.

"[Interviewer] You said you have been to Hungary?

"[Howard] Yes, I have been to Hungary, to Budapest; to the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia—Prague.

"[Interviewer] Ed, our letters contain very many questions about the work of the CIA. Can you tell us anything about it?

"[Howard] I will try. I know that this is interesting for your people.

"[Interviewer] Our viewers would like to know how you were trained in the CIA. What was the aim behind your training? What mission were you given?

"[Howard] Well, I was trained as an operations officer. My cover was to be a diplomatic one. My work as an operations officer in the CIA was to consist in recruiting agents and controlling them. I was trained in this for a whole year, and we studied many things. The training was very intensive.

"[Interviewer] What were your feelings at that time for Soviet people? For the Soviet Union?

"[Howard] To be honest with you, I knew very little about the Soviet Union. Probably as much as the average American. I knew that yours is a very big and hostile country, that you had a large military power. During my training, of course, I tried to find out a bit more about your culture, language, and people. I studied Russian before I ended up in Moscow, and so I tried to read Russian and Soviet literature.

"When I look at my conflict with the CIA, I see that it is, was more political than anything else. I believe in the rights of people and in the rights of every person. But I do not believe in secret operations and clandestine wars. My years with the CIA and the time since I broke with it have made me more mature, I suppose. Now I am much older, and I can evaluate what has happened to me more soberly. What do I really believe in? I believe in what I have just said. But at that time, I thought that working in the CIA would just be romantic and interesting. But in the CIA my desire, my longing for adventure started to clash with my political convictions. I believe strongly that every person should be kindly towards others and more open. So, my conflict with the CIA was predictable and quite understandable.

"[Interviewer] What are you doing here now? What do you work on? What sort of life do you have?

"[Howard] A totally normal one. I have a smallish home in Moscow's suburbs where I live and work. Generally, my work is to do economic research and surveys for many Moscow institutes. I specialize on the capitalist economy. By and large, I have a normal way of life.

"[Interviewer] I should like to see that for myself. Is that possible?

"[Howard] Yes, of course. I invite you to visit tomorrow, if you have the time. Come to my dacha and take a look at how I live. Everything is normal.

"[Interviewer] Fine, we will do that. Thank you. In the meantime, can I suggest going together to Kalinin Prospekt? Perhaps we could walk a little there around the old Arbat and chat a bit more?

"[Howard, in Russian] With pleasure."

The two men are seen from the back as they drive in an unidentified car through Moscow.

"[Interviewer] Ed, you have a wonderful car.

"[Howard] Yes, I enjoy it. But, as I have already told you, I do not like to drive very much. Better to go on public transport. Moscow has a very good underground. It is very clean and comfortable. It is a good day for driving. Very good weather. There is not too much filth

and snow on the roads. In general, Moscow is a very clean city. If there is very much snow in the United States, everything freezes up and stops working, so you can not get through."

Next the men are filmed strolling through the Arbat, chatting.

"[Howard, in poor Russian] You know that I do not live here all the time, but when I am in Moscow—I have my friends, and we meet, indulge in some sport and all the rest. [Howard switches to English] It is very comfortable.

"[Interviewer] Here we saw the artists on the Arbat. Ed says he has seen their work but has not yet bought anything. Why?

"[Howard, in Russian] You know Izmailovo? There is an exhibition there. Especially pictures. Old Russian pictures.

"[Interviewer] You like old Russian paintings?

"[Howard] Yes, yes.

"[Interviewer] The style of old Russian painting.

"[Howard] Precisely.

"[Interviewer] I ask where else he has been and what he likes in Moscow. Ed replies that he has been to the Bolshoy Theater and many museums, Moscow University, and Zagorsk."

The interviewer is seen emerging from behind a minibus outside a red brick building with a clear glass front door, behind which Howard is seen. Howard comes through the door to welcome his visitor. After hand shakes and a certain amount of confusion as to who should go in first, they disappear into the house. The interviewer speaks off-camera, saying: "My second meeting with Ed Howard took place the following day, here, at his dacha outside Moscow, where he had invited us." Then Howard talks with the interviewer:

"[Howard, in English] Please, come on in and have some coffee.

"[Interviewer] Thank you, thank you.

"[Howard] This is the house I live in. Please go on through. Fireplace, Christmas tree.

"[Interviewer] I can see it is a very nice dacha.

"[Howard] Thank you very much. It is a lovely place, as you can see. There is a forest just outside, and when I have the time I go skiing. Sometimes I go for walks along the bank of the Moscow River."

The only room shown on camera is a spacious living room with parquet flooring, a large fireplace built into a corner beside French windows that appear to lead outside. There is a fairly modern television set, but there is no sign of the Christmas tree. Access to the second floor appears to be by pine staircase. Howard and the interviewer continue:

"[Howard] I work and rest here in summer and sometimes in winter.

"[Interviewer] You were saying you have an apartment in town.

"[Howard] Yes, I am very well fixed. I have no complaints.

"[Interviewer] Ed, you promised to tell me about your meeting with the U.S. writer David Wise.

"[Howard] David Wise is an author who, for many years—since 1960—has been studying and writing in the United States about topics connected with the intelligence services. His "The Invisible Government" is one of his best-known and most popular books. Then, just under a year ago, I received a letter from your embassy in Washington, saying that he wanted to meet me. I pondered on this for several months and eventually decided to meet him. The meetings took place last summer. We spent almost the entire week together, and there were almost 30 hours of interviews. We spoke a great deal about my life—why I came here, how I am getting on here, what my future holds. I gave an interview, typing up my answers. I am very well aware that in many Western countries, there is incorrect information about my life, and I wanted to put forward my point of view: the way I regard my life and my fate. What has happened to me. My attitude toward the CIA. Why I left the CIA. What I am doing just now. Most of the articles published about me in Western newspapers contain false statements. They are not based on facts, and so I decided to have my say. So I met him, and we had a good time. We had useful and productive talks. I hope that when his book appears in the spring, my opinion about my life will see the light of day.

"[Interviewer] Are you sure that it will be your opinion and the way you see things that will be published?

"[Howard] I hope so. Of course, there is no guarantee. But I am counting on the fact that a writer as serious as David Wise will not act against his conscience. I do think my story—my version—will be in the book, and readers will see for themselves where the truth lies.

"[Interviewer] Ed, have you no desire to write your own book about your life?

"[Howard] I have thought seriously about this on several occasions, and I still do not know. I think that after I see David's book and after some time passes, then maybe I

shall start writing my book: because I have had a unique life. I did not ask for these circumstances; I was just thrown into them. Every person wants to live his own life, but nobody can imagine living without his people. This is natural. Another reason for writing a book is that I have seen the life of the Soviet people and of other people in the socialist countries where I have been from the inside. The Americans should know the truth: You are sincere and friendly people. You are very hospitable. I can see you have a sincere desire for peace and a longing to live a normal, peaceful life. Perhaps my story of my life here will help people understand one another better. I am very glad to see more and more American tourists—and also British and French—coming here. They can see everything for themselves and can see that you are in no way an evil empire as President Reagan says. That people are simply living together, working together, and craving peace. That in 70 years you have achieved a very great deal.

"[Interviewer] Ed, I would like to hear your opinion about the processes that are going on in our country in economic and political life. I mean about the changes that are taking place here in our country.

"[Howard] I think you are living at a wonderful time. The restructuring begun by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is essential and has already brought about changes. I have become convinced of this from my talks with ordinary people on the street. I see great hope, a striving for ideals, and a rebirth of the spirit that began 70 years ago. I believe this is very good. I am an economist, and I know that the Soviet Union has huge natural resources and that you have enormous potential in the human resources sense. Your people are well educated—some of the most educated in the world. So the combination of the material resources with the human factor could give the country's development a great shove. Not just the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, but the whole world. The United States is presently building up the Star Wars program. This is something I simply cannot agree with because the program just undermines the economy. Large sums of money are diverted from peaceful goals to military needs. If the two superpowers—the Soviet Union and the United States—could switch their material and human resources to resolving peaceful tasks, the world would be better for everyone. I believe this is just what Mikhail Sergeyevich wants to do.

"[Interviewer] Ed, as an economist in 1980, in a traditional nationwide competition, you were recognized to be one of the United States's most talented young people. You are now a mature person, and it would be interesting to learn your opinion about Soviet-U.S. relations.

"[Howard] I was happy when, in the final month of 1987, a summit meeting was held in Washington, many years after the fresh outbreak of the cold war—this period started in 1980 and continued to 1985. There were many misunderstandings that arose in those years

and many conflicts in various parts of the world. Now realism has started to make headway. It started to appear on the U.S. side with the help of a push from the Soviet side, administered by Gorbachev. An understanding is beginning to grow that we have to live together in this world, despite the fact that we have different ideologies. There is no reason why we should not live in peace. We have a good chance to develop economic cooperation and cultural exchanges. I think the summit meeting was devoted to this. It is with pleasure that I observe a growth in cooperation. We must all carry on a serious dialogue—a serious dialogue rather than merely resorting to propagandistic maneuvers. We must work together on this.

"[Interviewer] The last two—no, the last one—serious question: How do you envisage your future?"

"[Howard] That is a good question. After more than a year and a half here in the Soviet Union, I am now thinking a lot about this. Where will I live permanently? What will my permanent work be? For me this is a very important question. I am gradually solving these problems. I would like to continue with my economic research, not only in the Soviet Union. Joseph Edison, one of our philosophers, once said: The basis of happiness for every person in this life is for every person to have something to do, somebody to love, and some hope. This is a very simple idea, but it has those three very important elements. I feel at home in the Soviet Union. So my reply to your question will be: Today I feel at home and feel that I will stay here. I have creative and productive work. I am healthy, feel good, and the only thing I would like is to have more friends.

"[Interviewer] Ed, I would like to wish you happiness in your life. Just human happiness.

"[Howard] Thank you very much. It has been very nice to meet you and talk to you. I shall be glad to meet you again.

"[Interviewer, in English] Thank you."

The final interview took place entirely in what is claimed to be Howard's dacha, around a coffee table.

Ponomarev Assesses Value of Moscow Summit
PM2006154788 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 17 Jun 88 First Edition p 3

[Observer M. Ponomarev article under the rubric "International Observer Replies to Reader": "Trend Which Prevailed"]

[Text] A letter from Captain First Rank I. Rogalskiy, retired, a war participant from Sevastopol, stands out from the editors' mail devoted to the Moscow summit meeting. He raises this question:

"I followed attentively the meeting between the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the U.S. President. Television and the press gave it extensive coverage. But it seems to me that the results of the meeting were far from being as significant as certain commentators maintain. No major agreements were reached in the disarmament sphere or on other very important international problems. On the other hand, Reagan received an opportunity to appear in the role of a 'defender of the rights and freedoms' of the Soviet people. Did we invite him to Moscow for this? Perhaps I am wrong here and fail to understand something? I would like to receive an explanation on this question."

I think you are, nonetheless, wrong, Ivan Onufriyevich, although certain grounds for the doubts voiced by you do exist. International relations in the modern world in general and Soviet-U.S. bilateral relations in particular—or rather, even, primarily—are very complex and contradictory. It is difficult to make an unequivocal assessment of them. Therefore, as in all other cases, in order not to make a mistake, it is necessary to select the main, chief thing and concentrate one's attention on what is most important.

So what was important at the Moscow summit meeting? Its chief result was the continuation and further development of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue, which now embraces all the central problems of world politics and bilateral relations. The trend which prevailed in this difficult and frequently strained dialogue, M.S. Gorbachev said at a meeting with participants in the recent Moscow CPSU Gorkom plenum, was the trend toward improving Soviet-U.S. relations in the interests of our two countries and all mankind.

This result of the Moscow meeting enables us to describe it as a major international event. Figuratively speaking, it laid bricks in the edifice of not only today's but also future Soviet-U.S. relations and defined the preconditions for moving into the 21st century. All this was reflected in the final document—the top-level joint statement in Moscow. The statement is a large-scale political document marking an entire stage in the two countries' politics. It assesses what has been done during the 6 months since the Washington meeting of the leaders of the USSR and the United States and done at the meeting in Moscow.

This document has been published, and there is no need to give a detailed account of it here. I will emphasize just two or three aspects which, in my view, make it possible to describe the Moscow meeting precisely as, first, necessary and, second, useful and successful.

The process of accords on the elimination of Soviet and U.S. intermediate-and shorter-range missiles was completed. The exchange of instruments of ratification and the entry of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range

missiles into force were a landmark political event in the Soviet-U.S. dialogue and in all world politics. This was a common victory for reason and realism.

The progress in such a vitally necessary but difficult and delicate sphere as disarmament was defined. If things are managed efficiently, there is a possibility of reaching a treaty on the radical reduction of strategic offensive arms. The Soviet side advanced a major new initiative regarding the talks on reducing arms and armed forces in Europe. A package of 9 bilateral agreements was signed, and 47 such agreements have been concluded in all over the past 3 years. Regional conflicts were discussed in depth, and real opportunities were outlined for resolving these "tight" knots on the basis of political approaches and a balance of interests.

I could also mention some other aspects. But what I have said is probably sufficient to be able to claim that the Moscow meeting confirmed the new state of Soviet-U.S. relations—their normality, stability, and growing constructiveness. R. Reagan's visit to Moscow and the talks held here will serve to further improve relations between our countries and to develop and strengthen them and will raise them to a still higher level. In my opinion, THE NEW YORK TIMES put it well, writing about this: "The holding of a meeting and talks on questions great and small is becoming a normal phenomenon. And the more everyday and commonplace relations between the two countries become, the better for everyone."

But could more have been achieved at the Moscow meeting? This question occurs not only to us, Ivan Onufriyevich. It worries many people. The answer to it is obvious: Yes, it could. But it was not possible because of the contradictory nature of the U.S. stand.

Thus, the Soviet proposal to make a clear-cut characterization of the present-day political realities as a platform of intention and political action was not passed. After a sharp debate, the U.S. side refused to include this characterization in the final document. An opportunity to take a big step toward shaping civilized international relations was thereby missed.

It was not possible to resolve all the problems relating to the treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive arms, particularly questions of sea-launched cruise missiles and the terms of compliance with the ABM Treaty during the mutually agreed time. Nor was it possible to reach final agreement on the subject of the talks on conventional arms in Europe. The Soviet initiative in this connection, which I have already mentioned, was not supported by the U.S. side.

The U.S. speculations on human rights questions elicited a just response from Soviet people. They were precisely speculations—the President himself, for example,

admitted that the meeting organized for him with dissidents, whom its organizers tried to pass off as representatives of the Soviet public, was a meeting with rather unpleasant people. Nevertheless, it took place anyway and received a "big press," as people say in America.

What need did the President have of these renegades—I cannot find another word for them? There are several reasons: On certain issues, including judgments on human rights in the USSR, R. Reagan came to Moscow with yesterday's stances. The pressure which certain U.S. circles exert on him is great, too. They accused the President of being "soft on communists," "forgetting America's interests," and so forth. All this was felt during the Moscow meeting, at which the U.S. side sometimes found it difficult to take even small steps.

All this is undoubtedly so. It would, of course, be better for everyone if we had no reason to dwell on these negative aspects. But I will emphasize once again that the chief thing is that the Moscow meeting demonstrated that the Soviet-U.S. dialogue has emerged from the sphere of rhetoric into the sphere of real politics. The desire and wish to engage in real politics is increasingly distinguishing meetings between the Soviet and U.S. leaders.

Politics in general and real, realistic politics in particular are the art of the possible. Precisely this art was demonstrated during the Moscow meeting. The French newspaper LE MONDE wrote: "In M.S. Gorbachev's opinion, the meeting could have been more productive. However, the next meeting will be, and so we should not dramatize the results of this one. The CPSU Central Committee general secretary was able to use its shortcomings and weak points with the art of a strategist thinking about the long term." I think that is putting it correctly. The Moscow meeting was a step on the way to lasting and secure peace.

Lobachenko Views Pentagon Procurement Scandal
OW2106023088 Moscow Television Service
in Russian 2135 GMT 20 Jun 88

[Vadim Lobachenko commentary from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Washington news centers around the growing scandal in connection with the revelation of large-scale corruption and fraud in the U.S. military procurement system. Our commentary:

[Lobachenko] Hello, comrades. "Operation Ill Wind" is the codename of a 2-year investigation of the Pentagon and military contractors by the FBI and other U.S. investigative agencies. This wind blew itself on to the pages of the press and exposed so much dirt to the public that even Americans, who have seen a great deal, were scandalized. Judge for your self: Hundreds of directors of the largest American military corporations, congressmen, and numerous Pentagon employees, are being

charged with corruption, bribery, fraud, and misuse of government funds. As THE NEW YORK TIMES observed, the participants of the scandal acted with the support of a whole network of personal and business ties existing between the military industry and the Pentagon. Of the \$2 trillion that the Reagan administration appropriated for military spending during the terms of its tenure, bribes and generous presents worth hundreds of millions, if not billions of dollars, got stuck in this intricate web. Michael Dukakis, the Democratic presidential candidate, made it clear that the present scandal is the result of the present administration's excessive military spending. He said that the flow of funds to the Pentagon was so abundant and accessible that it became uncontrollable. I would add that this abundant flow into the Pentagon's budget was made available by the administration, first and foremost, by trimming down social services. The poor were shortchanged so that these dollars would then find their way into the pockets of the Pentagon thieves. Does this not epitomize the social policies of the administration?

The present ill wind of disclosures on the eve of presidential elections is clearly not blowing into the sails of George Bush, the Republican hopeful. That explains his recent attempts to distance himself from the scandal, which is by no means the first for this Republican administration. The investigation into the crimes of the notorious Irangate has not yet been completed. Dozens of past and present officials of the current administration are accused of blatant disregard of ethics. In connection with this, representatives of the Democratic Party say that there has been a wave of indignation from the voters, which must reflect on the presidential as well as congressional elections this year. It appears that the forthcoming elections will be hard fought.

UK Paper on U.S.-Iran 'Secret Proximity Talks'
LD2006460088 Moscow TASS in English 1632 GMT
20 Jun 88

[Text] London June 20 TASS—The United States continues to maintain secret contacts with Iran.

The British newspaper THE INDEPENDENT reports today that for the past 18 months the United States has been conducting a series of secret "proximity talks" with Iranian officials in Geneva. The last two such meetings occurred in Geneva around May 15 and in Algiers around June 1.

The newspaper writes that the American aim is to maintain channels of dialogue with elements in the clerical regime to ensure a role for the United States in post-Khomeyni Iran.

The talks in Geneva and Algiers are pitched at low official level deliberately to avoid embarrassment to either government, the newspaper goes on. It is characteristic that the American-Iranian contacts were approved personally by George Shultz, U.S. secretary of

state, while John Whitehead, deputy secretary of state and Richard Murphy, assistant secretary of state for Near-Eastern affairs, monitor progress closely, and may have attended one or more sessions in person.

On the Iranian side special envoy Sadiq Tabataba'i, who is brother-in-law to Khomeyni's son Ahmad, and Mohammad Javad Larijani, deputy foreign minister for European and North American affairs, are both said to be involved. The newspaper recalls that Mr. Tabataba'i has played "a key role" in previous hostage talks between the United States and Iran in the period of Irangate.

In addition, the U.S. has developed a second channel to the Iranian Government through contacts between Vernon Walters, the U.S. ambassador to the U.N., and Mohammad Ja'far Mahallati, his English-educated Iranian counterpart.

Veterans Demand U.S. Extradite Alleged Criminal
PM2106072788 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
18 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Letter from reader A.V. Orzhakhovskiy. "Now We Are Appealing Through the Newspaper"]

[Text] Kalanchak Settlement, Kherson Oblast—I, A.V. Orzhakhovskiy, member of the Kalanchak Settlement Soviet, Kherson Oblast, Ukrainian SSR, am writing to you at the behest of the War and Labor Veterans Council.

Esteemed Editorial Office! It is more than 40 years since the war ended.

The sacred memory of the numerous victims of it impels us to seek just punishment for war criminals.

The enemy occupied our settlement on 11 September 1941. The occupation regime was accompanied by mass arrests, and the torture and shooting of Soviet people. The fascist lackey P.Ye. Starostenko, who found refuge in the United States after the war, actively participated in the atrocities and torture.

The settlement ispolkom has repeatedly appealed and continues to appeal to Great Patriotic War veterans, soldiers' widows, young people, and other inhabitants of the rayon center about the need to assemble the settlement's citizens in order to demand that the war criminal P.Ye. Starostenko be brought to trial.

Such a meeting has been held. Its resolution and the text of an appeal to the U.S. President to hand over Starostenko to Soviet justice have been sent to R. Reagan in the White House.

It is now 10 months since the meeting. My fellow villagers have received no reply to their appeal to the U.S. Administration. The settlement War and Labor Veterans Council then decided to visit the U.S. Embassy and hand in another letter to Mr Reagan.

On crossing the threshold of the U.S. Embassy building, our group of deputies sensed hostility and ill will on the part U.S. officials. Nobody wanted to listen to us. One staffer bearing the number 0846 on his chest badge just kept on angrily repeating: "Who let you in here?"

After leaving the embassy, we decided to tell the readers of your newspaper about our "reception" at the U.S. Embassy and about our appeals to President Reagan.

We still hope to receive a positive reply from the United States about the deportation of this war criminal to the USSR.

Stavropol Signs Contact Agreement With Iowa
*LD1806101888 Moscow TASS in English 0825 GMT
18 Jun 88*

[Text] Stavropol June 18 TASS—TASS correspondent Nikolay Styazhkin reports:

An agreement on the establishment of direct contacts between Stavropol territory and Iowa, signed in the Executive Committee of the Stavropol Territorial Soviet of People's Deputies, reflects the reality of the climate of growing mutual trust and business interest between the Soviet Union and the United States following the summit meetings.

"Contacts between the Russian territory and my state were established way back last year when we made the first get-acquainted tours of each other's territories", Terry Branstad, the governor of Iowa, the leader of the American delegation, pointed out after the signing ceremony.

"Iowa businessmen have got something to offer to the agri-industrial sector of Stavropol territory, particularly in the field of technology for the processing and storage of grain and food. We are interested in a whole number of non-traditional products turned out by Stavropol people, grape products, in particular".

It has also been decided to develop direct trade in machinery, equipment, hand-made woollen goods, carpets, and souvenirs. The two sides endorsed an extensive programme for mutually beneficial cooperation on the problems of science, culture, health care, education, the study of languages, sports, pre-school education, environmental protection, and joint actions to promote relaxation of international tension and to end the arms race. It is planned to effect exchanges of delegations in a whole number of cases on a contractual non-currency basis.

Today the governor of Iowa and his companions continued business meetings with Stavropol people. The programme includes familiarisation with the way sanatorium treatment is organized at Caucasian spas, and a visit to the Terskiy stud-farm which is widely known on the international market.

China

Special Envoy Tian Zengpei in Moscow for Talks

Meets With Rogachev

*LD2006174788 Moscow TASS in English 1727 GMT
20 Jun 88*

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—The twelfth round of Soviet-Chinese political consultations was held in Moscow from June 13 to 20. During the consultations Igor Rogachev, special envoy of the Soviet Government, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, and Tian Zengpei, special envoy of the Chinese Government, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the PRC, continued the discussion of matters connected with normalising relations between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China in a businesslike and frank atmosphere.

It was pointed out that the two countries' contacts and ties had received development over the period that had passed since the previous round of consultations, and that there existed considerable opportunities for the promotion of Soviet-Chinese relations in various fields.

Much attention was devoted to the Kampuchean problem. The sides set out their positions in detail.

There was an exchange of views on a number of international issues, including the situation in the Asia-Pacific region.

The two sides agreed to hold a third meeting of government delegations of the USSR and the PRC to the talks on border issues in Moscow in October 1988.

Next, 13th, round of Soviet-Chinese political consultations is to be held in Beijing in April-May 1989.

Received by Shevardnadze

*LD2006183988 Moscow TASS in English 1800 GMT
20 Jun 88*

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—Today Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, received Tian Zengpei, special envoy of the Chinese Government at the Soviet-Chinese political consultations, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the PRC.

During the meeting Eduard Shevardnadze spoke of the process of revolutionary renewal of Soviet society and of the importance of the forthcoming 19th all-union party conference. "The restructuring process in the USSR and reforms in China are not only a major factor in the life of our two countries but are of international importance as well. The opinion of the Soviet leadership is that it is essential to proceed further in strengthening goodneighbourliness and mutually-beneficial cooperation, mutual trust, and in broadening the political dialogue and in raising its level".

Having emphasized the importance of efforts to resolve regional conflicts, Eduard Shevardnadze pointed out that a new situation was taking shape in Kampuchean affairs, the situation which opened quite good prospects for a solution to the problem. "The Soviet Union is interested in the earliest settlement of the Kampuchea situation and in the establishment of peace, stability and goodneighbourliness in South East Asia, and is ready to promote the process as much as it can."

Tian Zengpei expressed satisfaction with the development of relations between the two countries in recent years. He positively referred to the restructuring which is being effected in the Soviet Union and which, he said, arouses great interest in the PRC. The Chinese envoy set out his country's viewpoint on a number of international problems and, in particular, on a settlement of the conflict in Indochina.

The meeting was held in a businesslike and friendly atmosphere.

Departs for Beijing 21 Jun

LD2106073488 Moscow TASS in English 0657 GMT
21 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 21 TASS—Tian Zengpei, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the People's Republic of China, special representative of the Chinese Government, left Moscow for Beijing today after the end of the 12th round of Soviet-Chinese political consultations.

Near East & South Asia

Afghan Rebel Government in Exile Assessed

Mas'ud Leads 'Administration'

LD2006133388 Moscow TASS in English 1215 GMT
20 Jun 88

[Text] Kabul June 20 TASS—Afghan Armed Forces have conducted a series of successful operations against anti-government groups over the past two days, killing at least 50 extremists in the provinces of Takhar, Zabol and Nangarhar, BAKHTAR News Agency reported.

Large amounts of weapons, including rockets, mortars and grenades, were seized as a result of the clashes. Several extremists, including the leader of a rebel group, were taken prisoner.

Another 50 prisoners convicted for anti-government activities, in the meantime, have been released from jails in Jowzjan and Qandahar Provinces in keeping with the presidential amnesty.

They expressed gratitude to the nation's leadership for the humane attitude shown to them and pledged not to resume armed struggle against the lawful government.

Up to 100 former refugees returned home from Pakistan through the border post Torgham Sunday, it has been reported from Nangarhar Province. According to the repatriation agency, over 4,000 Afghans have crossed the frontier in that area over the past month on their way from refugee camps in Pakistani territory.

It has become known here that the leaders of the "Alliance of the Seven" announced the formation of a so-called "provisional administration" Sunday to exercise guidance over the Afghan opposition based in Pakistan.

The "Alliance"'s Ahmad Shah Mas'ud was put at the head of the administration.

That its formation is a hopeless gesture is obvious even to the commanders of anti-government groups operating in Afghanistan, who have dismissed the move as being "of no significance".

Sayyed Wali Shah, a leading member of the People's Islamic Party of Afghanistan, meanwhile, has voiced his party's strong backing for the national reconciliation policy pursued by the Afghan leadership and for the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan.

Speaking in an interview with the KABUL TIMES, he said the party's overriding mission in the existing situation was to help restore peace and security to the land and settle disagreements between the Afghans.

Sayyed Wali Shah said those goals were being sought by the entire nation, except for the short-sighted extremists who were reluctant to reckon with popular aspirations and were hampering a normal life, killing innocent people and firing rockets on Kabul.

He added that those actions were inconsistent with Islam.

Hikmatyar Role Viewed

LD2006224888 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1500 GMT 20 Jun 88

Aleksandr Malikov commentary]

[Text] And now about events in one of the world's hot spots—I have Afghanistan in mind. All foreign news agencies reported that on Sunday in the Pakistani border town Peshawar, the Alliance of Seven—a group that represents the bulk of the Afghan opposition forces—announced the setting up of a provisional government of Afghanistan in exile. Named in Peshawar were the president, 2 of his deputies, and 12 ministers. I have asked my colleague Aleksandr Malikov to comment on this report:

[Malikov] The opposition forces have taken a step forecast by observers some time ago. It is true that earlier they had intended to announce the setting up of their government after the seizure of a major administrative center on Afghan territory. It now appears that impatience gained the upper hand.

The main thing, however, is evidently something else: The opposition has to take reality into account. There has been no quick victory—if such a thing is at all possible—and following the withdrawal of the Soviet troops, which has already started, not a single major city has fallen at their feet like a ripe piece of fruit, as they had used to state earlier. That is why the opposition had to add a relevant clarification to the name of the current government—"in exile." Although, if one is to be fully precise, most of its members—whose names foreign agencies painstakingly enumerate—had left Afghanistan of their own free will.

The opposition figures, headed by Ahmad Shah Mas'ud, who graduated as an engineer in the United States, state that it is their intention to gain international recognition. But that is far away. For the time being, ministerial portfolios—which, in essence, are nothing but a sham—have been handed out no more. This is because the ambitions of the cabinet announced in Peshawar are not as yet backed up by anything real, because the situation in the country as a whole is not under the control of a government set up on paper outside Afghanistan but under the control of a real one in Kabul.

Even in the United States, where there are those who regard the Afghan opposition as their own offspring, sober views are voiced advising not being in too much of a hurry to lend support to the provisional government set up by the opposition forces. Thus, Selig Harrison—the prominent expert on Asian problems and senior Carnegie Fund staff member—recently warned the State Department that support for a government of this kind would be an extremely risky strategy that could drag the United States into a prolonged civil war on the side of Islamic fundamentalists. Nor can one fail to be put on one's guard by the fact that the most uncompromising

part of the Peshawar opposition government—the Hikmatyar grouping—turns out to be in charge of foreign policy questions. It is precisely Hikmatyar who continues to reject the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan. It is precisely he who states that there will be no room for PDPA members in Afghanistan's future coalition government.

However, compromises are unavoidable, no matter what the opposition leaders say now. Everyone can see that the Afghans are mortally weary of the war and this means that they will lend their support, first and foremost, to those who return long-awaited peace to their homes. This can be done only by conducting a national dialogue using the language of national reconciliation.

Afghan Chief of Staff Views Army's Prospects

PM2006141688 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 18 Jun 88 First Edition p 5

[Candidate of Historical Sciences V. Ivanenko report attributed to "APN for KRASNAYA ZVEZDA": "Afghanistan: Army and Revolution"]

[Excerpts] Kabul—The withdrawal of units of Soviet troops from Afghanistan is still one of the main topics in the world press. Articles on this subject often ask the questions that concern many people today: Will the Afghan Army itself, if necessary, be able to withstand the pressure from the "irreconcilables"? Is it as weak as the opposition seeks to make out? [passage omitted]

The other day questions connected with the Afghan Army took me to the Defense Ministry of the Republic of Afghanistan. My interviewee is a colonel general who is not yet 40. He is Shanawa Tanai, chief of the Afghan Army General Staff. [passage omitted]

[Ivanenko] Western journalists are constantly asking a question which, I think, is equally interesting to the Soviet reader. The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan began a month ago. The Pakistani side is still behaving as if it had not signed the Geneva agreements. Will the Afghan Army itself be able to withstand the armed detachments of the opposition?

[Tanai] To answer briefly, yes, it will. Judge for yourself, our army is armed with modern weapons. In past years we have acquired combat experience and have raised professionally trained military cadres capable of tackling complex tasks autonomously. Of course, the enemy seeks to actively influence the army and tries to demoralize it. Pamphlets are constantly appearing calling for people to go over to the "irreconcilables," and soldiers are subjected to religious indoctrination. Unfortunately, in some places the ideological saboteurs are managing to achieve their goals.

But we are not sitting idle. We are doing everything to establish tough control and increase the personal responsibility of commanding officers, staffs, and political

organs for the unconditional fulfillment of combat tasks and plans for combat training and political study and for the quality of exercises. The command demands the identification of specific culprits responsible for poor performance, omissions, and weaknesses in troop training, the lowering of their level of combat capability and combat activeness, and the defection of servicemen to the enemy's side, and demands that strict proceedings be taken against them.

For more than a year now we have been pursuing a policy of national reconciliation and trying not to conduct combat operations until the enemy forces us to do so. And in such cases we act resolutely. We recently struck a number of powerful blows against armed opposition detachments in the provinces of Paktia, Faryab, and Qonduz. The enemy suffered considerable losses and a large quantity of weapons and ammunition were confiscated. In many regions, in the struggle against counterrevolutionaries we collaborate successfully with local tribal formations. Nonetheless we are trying to act more with words than with weapons, and therefore many of our operations could be described not as military operations, but more correctly as military-political. The Army helps the population with manpower and gives them economic assistance. [Tanai ends]

That is the view of the Afghan Army held by one of the country's best known military leaders. Difficult times lie ahead for the Armed Forces of the Republic of Afghanistan. The future will show how they will cope with the tasks facing them. It seems to me that success will depend largely on a reasonable balance between political dialogue with representatives of the Afghan opposition who have a sense of responsibility for the future of their native land, and resolute actions against the "irreconcilables." That is doubtless also true of the whole of Afghanistan, a country where the main weapon now is consensus and talks. Here nothing can be resolved by guns alone.

'Political Prisoners' in Afghanistan Profiled
PM2006160388 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
No 23, 5 Jun 88 p 7

[Aleksandr Mostovshchikov dispatch: "Behind the Walls of the Pol-e Charki"]

[Text] "No one is being kept in these cells," we were told by Zabet, commandant of the guards at the Pol-e Charki Prison in Kabul. "All those who signed a protocol acknowledging the national reconciliation policy have been released."

We looked into empty wards with two-tier spring beds. They looked uncomfortable without mattresses. But somehow we wouldn't want these cells to be filled with the hum of voices again, or for the 75 beds contained in each to receive any long-term occupants. Silence in most of Pol-e Charki is also a feature of the present-day situation in Afghanistan.

And yet, over 1,700 prisoners still look at the sky through its long and narrow iron-barred windows. These are criminals and various enemies of the current regime. We were given an opportunity to talk to some of them.

The powerful fortress walls with towers are elegant in their own way, a tank dug into the ground not far from the gates, guards on the outside with submachine guns—such is this prison on the outskirts of Kabul. We take the traditional tea in a small room of the commandant of the guards. Zabet is young, slender and reticent. Boris Leorov of TRUD and I, almost simultaneously, displayed our curiosity:

"Have there been escapes?"

"Yes, there have been," comes the frank reply from a man who is duty bound to do all he can to prevent this. We understand that ours was not the main question, but rather more an idle one. But the sincerity of the reply was touching.

The prison is not a museum. Although excursions are allowed, they are sad, and make you think about how far we still are from the ideal in human relationships. We walk across an inner courtyard which is as hot as a frying pan. A circle of some eight to ten men is sitting in the shadow near the wall. Seeing us, they rise. A gray-bearded man greets Zabet.

"My relatives have come to visit me," he explains.

We understand: the man with the beard is a prisoner. The prisoners discuss everyday issues, they probably talk about the start of the Soviet pullout from Afghanistan, guess what will follow this, and no doubt think about their further destiny—both those who will remain in Pol-e Charki after the visit and those who will pass out of the iron-barred gates.

We copied the prison's current statistics into our notebooks with the commandant's help. The age range of Pol-e Charki prisoners is from 18 to 55 years. The maximum sentence is 20 years. The number of prisoners who committed criminal offenses totals 274. There are women here too—both common criminals and political prisoners. Some of them fought against the people's government with arms in hand.

What have most of the criminals been sentenced for? Theft, murder, bribery, embezzlement.... And how do they serve their sentences? Working as tailors and carpenters, repairing cars, doing metal and building work, in laundries.... What does life in prison look like? The regime, of course, is not resort-like. Only 29 afghanis a day used to be allotted for food. A month ago, the prison was visited by a commission which decided to raise this number to 40. This is miserly, of course. But relatives bring in parcels and money. At the prison food tent you can buy potatoes, rice, green beans, fats and sweets. In each cell there are two or three electric stoves—anyone is

able to cook whose relatives provide him with food or money. Life is not idyllic—but prison is prison. And what's more Pol-e Charki has special places where inmates can pray.

We diligently entered all this down in our notebooks. These facts and figures gave us a picture of eastern prison life which differs in many respects from the same life in Europe. We asked, for instance, how the prisoners obtain news. They receive newspapers. But there are many who cannot read and write. Therefore the main source of information in the cell is the television set—not one that has been provided by the state, of course, but one that is privately owned.

It is from such telecasts that a bulky man with strong, but sleek hands, short-cut hair and a pitch-black moustache and beard learned about the start of the Soviet pullout. In the commandant's room to which he was escorted, he politely greeted everyone and sat down crossing his legs. A watch glittered on his wrist. Haji Allah Muhammad, 33, did not produce the impression of a man tortured by life. Although he has many sins to his name. And his death sentence, changed to 20 years' imprisonment, speaks for itself.

Haji's pre-prison biography is typical for a dushman. And he told it in a humdrum voice. He lived in the northern part of the Kabul Province. A peasant, his family consisted of eight persons—his wife, mother, brothers and sisters. He was illiterate. How did he end up in Pakistan? It was said that Afghanistan had become an atheist state, that Islam was in danger.

In Pakistan he met his fellow-countrymen. They had had no combat training, but were given arms and a mission: sow discord, provoke anxiety, kill PDPA members, school principals and civil servants, whether they were Party members or not.

"And did you kill?"

"We killed," Haji says quietly. "I had 50 men under my command. We burned down two schools in the Kabul Province. Do I remember the people we killed? I remember three of them quite well. One was named Mastalam from the village of Bezate, and the other was Mirhord, also from there. Also, we finished off some old woman—she used to wander from village to village, and we thought she might betray us."

They never ran into Soviet troops, he assures us, they saw them, but were afraid of them.

"Who paid for this?" we wondered, asking a stereotype question.

The answer was somewhat surprising:

"We were not given a single afghani in Pakistan—we used to send money there ourselves: one or two million afghanis a month. We ambushed cargoes on the roads, sold the loot, and imposed our own tax on the population."

After six months of robbing, Haji was captured: he has been in jail for three years now. His biography, putting it bluntly, is typical: just like that of our second interlocutor, Nur Muhammad from Konduz. He, it's true, was less candid, and assured us that he hadn't killed anyone, that he had been taken into the band by force. But the man sitting next to him, who had once tried him, only smiled sadly on hearing this and waved his hand.

We understood that things were not so simple in the tangled, fratricidal Afghan war. We were far from primitive schemes, and the habitual division of events and people into black and white. Nor did we have material for any in-depth analysis. What we were interested in was this: now that the Soviet troops were leaving, the situation in the country was changing, and the policy of national reconciliation was gaining momentum. What do the people fenced off from the world by the powerful wails of Pol-e Charki think about this? What do they hope for and how do they see the future development of events?

"My relatives come to visit me," says Haji. "No one has taken their land away because of me. They work and lead a normal life. Also, they support the policy of national reconciliation."

"Well, and if you are released from jail, will you fight again against the present regime?" we asked.

"No," the man said curtly.

We were aware of where the conversation was taking place and in whose presence. We understood that some replies were too smooth. And we knew that there were also intransigents in Pol-e Charki, those who hated the present regime. Haji did not give the impression of being one of them.

Indeed, peace in Afghanistan depends on a number of reasons. And this article is not the place to analyze them. But the thoughts and decisions of the political prisoners at Pol-e Charki must not be left unheard. And, let's just hope that their number grows small and smaller.

Afghan Officials Cite Pakistani Violations
LD2106125088 Moscow TASS in English 1039 GMT
21 Jun 88

[Text] Kabul June 21 TASS—A press conference, devoted to the implementation of the Geneva accords, took place at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Afghanistan. Taking part in it were 'Abdul Ghafur Jawshan, head of the Foreign Ministry Bureau

"According to intelligence data, an ambush was being prepared as our column advanced," Yevnevich continued, "so the withdrawal did not turn out as ceremonial as we would have liked."

"Comrade Commander," a soldier from the checkpoint interrupted our conversation, "an Afghan has arrived... legless."

"Let him through at once!"

A few minutes later the commander was embracing an Afghan in national dress and carefully helping him into a staff car.

...During Operation "Mainline" to clear rebel gangs from the Gardeyz-Khowst road, a dushman antiaircraft missile downed a Soviet helicopter. An operational subunit of Afghan security officers went to the region from where the missile was fired. As previously, it was headed by Comrade Masum, a party member and chief of the Gardeyz State Security Administration's Department for Combating Banditry. Retribution befell the bandits who downed the helicopter. Only the security officers brought their commander back in a shelter half: a mine explosion.... When Masum left the hospital, he was awarded the star of a Hero of the Republic of Afghanistan.

"We do not have diplomatic relations with Masum," Yevnevich smiled broadly. "But, believe me, I have few friends such as him even in the USSR!"

Understandably, all our guys' thoughts today are for the USSR and home. How will their lives shape up, what will be their destiny? Our boys have learned to fight excellently, officers told me. But "serve"? Under the regulations, for example, soldiers must use the formal form of address with each other, not to mention everything else. But what question can there be of a formal form of address if the guys' friendship has been formed in grim battle and in the blood of dead friends?

The officers returning from Afghanistan also have many questions about the future. That landing force commander, for example, has received an appointment to a remote region. No, he does not seek "cushy" posts in life, and there can be no doubt that he will fulfill an order as befits a combat officer, and someone has to serve in the desert. But... does someone who has swallowed the dust of Afghan sands have to do so immediately, without a break? And what of his wife and two children, whom he has not seen for more than 2 years now—when he gets settled in the new place, will he be able to call his family to him...?

Journalists did not often come to Gardeyz, and so our conversation with the guys of the reconnaissance platoon was something out of the ordinary, and we asked each other questions in turn.

"Is it true that there are lots of punks back home?" Oleg Kulikov from Tashkent asked me quite seriously. After a moment's hesitation he composed himself: "No matter, Bekmurad and I only have to get home—that's right, Bek? For are we too not 'metalists' when we gird ourselves with machinegun cartridge belts or hang a couple of mines round our neck?"

Bekmurad Ergashev, his fellow countryman, smiled in reply.

"Have you thought what you will do after the Army?" it was now my turn to ask the questions.

It turned out that they had thought. It turned out that they had made a firm decision. Before going their separate ways in life, the reconnaissance scouts would travel as a complete platoon to Tomak, where Vladimir Vshivtsev, their combat commander blinded after an injury, now lives. First to Volodya, then home....

Pakistan Sending 'Terrorists' Into Afghanistan
LD2106005888 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 20 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; M. Leshchinskiy video report from Afghanistan]

[Text] Certain circles within and outside the country are not abandoning their attempts to discredit the role of the Soviet Army in this land. Things are reaching such a boiling point that, following incidents of shelling Kabul with rocket missiles by the armed opposition, rumors are being persistently circulated that this is the work of the Soviet Army or government troops. These pictures from film seized from the enemy tell us, by all interpretations, about preparations for further provocation in a camp in the territory of Pakistan. The video camera scrupulously records the details of a Soviet military uniform and weapons. The meaning of this costume farce is simple: to pass off another of the crimes of the opposition as an atrocity by our soldiers on Afghan soil. [video shows shots from the film, with pictures of rocket launchers, and zooming in on Soviet Army belts and small arms, gunfire, and explosions]

Many such stories end up in the hall of the special revolutionary court. Tades Muhammad and Muhammad Nadar, from the district of Chahar Dehi, also dressed up in soldiers' uniforms, most often, it is true, in Afghan ones. In just this manner they twice penetrated guard posts, personally killing three soldiers in the process. They engaged in pillage and robbery in the neighboring villages. In one of their caches these explosive devices were discovered, camouflaged as the most ordinary objects. How many times have such surprise mines blown up in state establishments, schools, and shops? The defendants testified that they had received all of this from Pakistan. Such a fact is a clear testimony of the

reluctance of the Pakistani side to promote the process of a peaceful settlement in Afghanistan, said the chairman of the special revolutionary court, 'Abdul Karim Sadam.

Moreover, Pakistan, by continuing its interference in the internal affairs of the republic, is directly breaching the second article of the bilateral agreement on the principles of mutual relations between our countries. Since the signing of the Geneva agreements, Dr Sadam emphasized, our court has already examined several cases of terrorists who have been sent from Pakistan. It is precisely the government of that country that bears responsibility for breaching international norms and the other principles of the Geneva agreements. [video shows two men in civilian clothes being led into court, a flask containing explosives being offered as evidence; interview with Sadam]

Pakistan Envoy Questioned on Soviet MIA's
*LD2006153088 Moscow TASS in English 1516 GMT
20 Jun 88*

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—The fate of Soviet servicemen who found themselves in the hands of the armed Afghan opposition is the cause of increasing concern among the public at large. U.N. Under-Secretary General Diego Cordovez stated that he intended specially to attend this problem.

The International Committee for the Rescue of Russian Prisoners of War in Afghanistan was formed in New York the other day. It comprises eminent cultural personalities and representatives of the public of the United States, Western Europe and the USSR who called for freeing Soviet prisoners of war. How does the Pakistani Administration react to these appeals and demands? TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov put this question to Shahid Mohammad Amin, ambassador of Pakistan to the USSR.

Being guided by humane considerations, the Pakistani Government pays the greatest attention to the issue of liberating Soviet prisoners and their return home, said the ambassador. At the same time, he alluded to difficulties involved in clearing out the exact number of Soviet prisoners and their location. The ambassador noted that in the Soviet Union the notion prevailed that many of them, if not the majority, are in Pakistani territory.

But this is borne out by facts, Yuriy Kornilov said. At a press conference involving five former Soviet prisoners, two of them—A. Zhurayev and M. Yazkuliye—said that they fled from captivity by escaping from the guard in Islamabad and reaching the USSR Embassy. Do not these pieces of evidence show that extremists hold their captives, or at least part of them, in Pakistani territory? More, in the capital of the country, just around the corner of the Pakistani authorities.

Yes, someone among the prisoners do get into our territory, Shahid Amin went on. And the Pakistani authorities, if they learn about these facts, seek to give assistance to these people, to contact them with the Soviet Embassy.

The ambassador also said that a large amount of work is being done now to bring it home to the Afghan opposition that it should set free the Soviet people taken prisoner and help them to return home. He expressed the hope that a successful solution to the problem would be found.

The public of our country favours an end to the Afghan tragedy on the basis of the Geneva agreements, so that Pakistan, Afghanistan and the Soviet Union live in peace and concord. And certainly, our public stands for the return home of all Soviet prisoners. People in Pakistan realize full well what feelings the kith and kin of Soviet servicemen who went missing or found themselves in captivity harbour now. The situation is complex but I believe in a good outcome, the ambassador of Pakistan said.

Apparent Fate of MIA in Afghanistan Described
*PM2006101188 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian
11 Jun 88 First Edition p 5*

[Article by KRSNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Lieutenant Colonel A. Oliynik: "Unconquered; the Story of One of the Soviet Soldiers Missing in Action in Afghanistan"]

[Text] The broad public's attention is drawn to the problem of our soldiers missing in action when fulfilling their international duty in Afghanistan. Letters which have come into the editorial office of KRSNAYA ZVEZDA and other newspapers testify to this. "We will do everything," M.S. Gorbachev said at a news conference at the conclusion of the recent Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, "to get our men back home."

We are approaching Salang. The road climbs ever more steeply upward, spiraling among the somber, sun-baked cliffs.

This is the place which is particularly marked out on my map. At this point the road turns sharply. The trees of a neglected garden are below. The outskirts of the village of Khenjan are seen beyond them. Yes, it happened precisely here. It happened a long time ago, back in December 1983.

From documents: "It has been established by investigation that: 1. At 0630 hours on 6 December 1983 a group consisting of Senior Warrant Officer Vladimir Grigoryevich Belov and crewmen—driver Private Askhat Gabdulsabirovich Gabbasov and senior rifleman Private

Vladimir Nikolayevich Kashirov—in an APC-70 (No 347), was directed to a sentry post with the task of delivering a motor and a gearbox needed to repair APC-70 No 335.

"On the journey close to the Khenjan observation post, the APC was blown up by a remote-control fougasse (a high explosive charge of between 50 and 60 kgs). It was thrown off the roadway and overturned...."

Reading into the document's words, I try to picture the events. The crew went out early in the morning when the road was still deserted. They were hurrying: They had to get back to the unit before lunch. Warrant Officer Belov had been given tasks like this more than once. Private Gabbasov was a skillful driver. Machinegunner Kashirov was also experienced enough. His military service was coming to an end: He was going home any day now.

They were around 2 km from Khenjan village. Everywhere was silence. But the crew, of course, still kept vigilant. Everyone knows that the dushmans receive a million afghanis for every vehicle put out of action! All the same....

An observer at one of the Salang posts saw the explosion flash and the column of smoke in the region of the village and reported this to the command. An armored team commanded by Warrant Officer V. Penkov went out to the explosion. And after a few minutes the company commander—Captain Yu. Chekrygin—arrived there with sappers.

From documents: "An armored team led by Warrant Officer V.N. Penkov reported an overturned and burning APC, with ammunition exploding inside.... After the explosions had stopped, they started to turn the extinguishers onto the vehicle. The bodies of two dead crew members were taken out of the armored carrier. Searches for the third continued until late dusk."

Unexpectedly, when it was already dark, Captain Chekrygin stumbled over a boot not far from the armored carrier. A bone gleamed in the burnt boot top.... The officer gave the order to stop the search. Everyone who was at the tragic spot came to the conclusion that the third crewman's body had been blown to pieces by the explosions.

In that snowy December, 1983 in Krasnoturinsk, a small town in the Urals, the Kashmirov family lived in expectation. They were waiting for the young man from far-off, troubled Afghanistan.

The eldest—Vyacheslav, crossing the threshold of his home after work, guessed from his mother's eyes that there was no news. Anna Georgiyevna was becoming increasingly withdrawn. On the long evenings she could look for hours at the only card from Volodya showing him in uniform. All thoughts were about him.

They had always lived in harmony. The eldest helped the youngest, and both helped their mother. When the father died in 1975 at the plant as a result of an accident, the sons took all the housework on themselves. They looked after their mother. When they had finished the eighth grade, one after the other they went out to work. Once trained as a specialist in electrical engineering at the vocational and technical school, Vladimir started working at the plant.

For 2 long years his warm and kind letters spoke to Anna Georgiyevna with the voice of a son. Even the shortest always calmed her. Vladimir first served in a training subunit not far from our southern border. At that time fate smiled on Anna Georgiyevna. The "Raduga" workshop collective, where she worked as team leader of the sewn goods production unit, gave her a tourist pass for success in competition. She intended to go to Czechoslovakia. Anna Georgiyevna began to fill in the forms. But then she changed her mind: She decided to go and see her son. She spent her holiday near him in a neighboring town.

And then she started to receive letters with a field postmark—from Afghanistan. Volodya wrote often. Anna Georgiyevna kept all 203 letters and knows each one of them almost by heart. When we met we read together through lines full of tenderness and gratitude.

"Hi, dear Mom and Slavik! Everything is fine here. Strictly speaking, I have already left for home but.... Never mind, soon we will be together.... Yes, many of my friends have already returned home. I won't hide it, I am just a bit envious of them. But never mind, I am doing my duty.

"Mom, look after yourself. Don't worry, dear, you'll see—everything will be fine.... International greetings to everyone. A big kiss for you. Vladimir. 25 November, 1983."

Anna Georgiyevna reads this letter, the last of the 203, more often than the others. Her son wrote it 24 days before his 20th birthday.

She will never forget that terrible hour when the military commissariat jeep came up to her workshop and behind it an ambulance. Anna Georgiyeva saw through the window of the Krasnoturinsk Military Commissariat and next to it an unknown warrant officer with a face darkened by a foreign tan. Forgetting herself, she threw herself upon him.

"Courage, mother...."

In the summer of 1984 a middle-aged visitor entered the consular section of the Soviet embassy in France. He was unwilling to give his name. He said only that he was a journalist and was carrying out an order from his compatriot—a doctor who was in the Afghan Panjsher Valley. The order was to pass on a package.

The package contained several color photographs. They showed a man with an emaciated, bristly face. He had a patch over his right eye fixed with plaster. A homemade wooden crutch is seen behind him. There was also a note in Russian on the envelope. Someone had written in a ballpoint pen in large scrawl.

"...You see, mother, instead of coming home, I am in Panjsher," the note ended. "I am just unlucky. Today is already 22 December. Mother dear, I will stop. Kisses. Vladimir. An address was on the back: Vladimir Nikolayevich Kashirov, block 16-24, Kolkhoznaya Street, Krasnoturinsk, Sverdlov Oblast. "624460." And below the note: "Mother—Anna Georgiyevna."

It was understood at the consulate that this concerned one of our soldiers, captured by the rebels. The package was immediately sent to the USSR Foreign Ministry, and from there to the USSR Armed Forces General Staff.

At the headquarters of the limited contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan I was able to see the papers relating to the investigation conducted at the orders of the General Staff. They show that during the first examination at the scene of the event a mistaken conclusion was drawn about the death of the third crew member—senior rifleman Private Kashirov. Although the boot with the severed foot at the edge of the crater was indeed his.

In a solemn ceremony the military commissariat handed over the Order of the Red Star, which was awarded to Vladimir posthumously, to the soldier's mother at the workshop where Anna Georgiyevna Kashirov works. And some time later, in August 1984, news was brought to Anna Georgiyevna's home once again.

"Something from Volodya?" the mother asked with her heart in her mouth.

"Yes, Anna Georgiyevna. Your son is alive!"

Some information on Private Kashirov was also acquired by our scouts in Afghanistan. At first this was a legend which emerged in Panjsher about the wounded "shuravi." In many details it coincided with the reality. The dushmans who blew up the APC had mistaken the soldier who had lost his foot for an officer, and carried him off, still unconscious, to their base. When they realized their mistake, they stoned him. But a foreign doctor who was in the area, at the base near Astaneh, noticed that the youth under the rocks was still alive, and decided to nurse him.

The captive's external features coincided with those of Private Kashirov: tall, dark-haired.

All measures had been taken to establish the soldier's whereabouts, but they had not succeeded in tracking him down. Then suddenly—a message from the scouts at one of the units:

"Documents seized during a combat operation in the Panjsher Valley include an anonymous note containing the following: "I am a captured Russian soldier. My APC was blown up by a mine, two men were killed, and I was wounded and captured. I am writing all this down in the hope that maybe someone will find the note. Now the southern gorge...." The last phrase, obviously, was not finished.

By his writing it was established that Private Kashirov was the author of the note. It was written a relatively long time ago. Nothing else has yet been established. Stories told by local inhabitants and former rebels who switched to the side of people's power have not clarified the picture. No one saw the captive or knew his name. But then there is no lack of evidence of the rebels' cruel treatment of those whom they manage to capture.

"I was kept in a cave where there was no light," one of our soldiers said who was snatched out of the rebels' torture chamber during a combat operation in September 1984. "They took away my uniform and footwear, and issued in their place a long shirt and wide trousers. I walked around barefoot. I was fed with scraps. Because of the strange sensation I felt after eating, I realized that they were adding narcotics. Correspondents from the United States, France and Britain called on me in the prison. They brought anti-Soviet literature, and tried to persuade me that freedom was possible if I agreed to go to the West. They said that life would be trouble-free...."

The latest news on Kashirov's fate came from precisely this soldier. "True, I did not actually meet him. I simply heard from a guard that one of the captured 'shuravi' had attempted to escape from him despite having lost an arm and a leg. This had happened when Soviet assault forces had landed not far from the cave-turned-prison and begun fighting. But, the guard claimed, Karim had not managed to escape."

Kashirov was called Karim by the dushmans—this was also established. They give all the captives Muslim names.

I have spent 2 years trying to discover the dramatic fate of Private Vladimir Kashirov, one of our soldiers missing in action in Afghanistan. At first it seemed that instead of "missing in action" he could definitely be described unequivocally as "captured." The letter which turned up in Paris, and the note found in the rebels' den convinced me of this. But time has once again placed all this in doubt. Is Vladimir alive today? How much truth was there in the guard's story about him. There is no answer. Once again we have to talk about someone missing in action.

But now I know for sure that Private Kashirov, who was awarded the Order of the Red Star, never failed in his duty as a soldier. The enemy succeeded in capturing him only when he was bleeding and unconscious. But no one saw him broken or subdued.

I also believe that in time we will find out the details of the revolt by our soldiers held in the torture chambers of the Badaber rebel camp in April 1985. I believe that many of those whose fate remains unknown are alive and will return home. The homeland waits for them like a mother.

Prospects for Mideast Settlement Assessed
PM2106083188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
19 Jun 88 Morning Edition pp 4-5

[Article by Konstantin Geyvandov under the rubric "Political Observer's Opinion": "Maintaining the Pace"]

[Text] The latest round of attempts to organize the process of peace talks on a settlement of the Near East conflict came to a conclusion in the first 10 days of June. For the fourth time in a brief period U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz visited the region to once again discuss the U.S. proposals on this issue, which came about as a result of the Palestinian uprising in the Israeli-occupied Arab territories. I feel that the steps being taken by the U.S. Administration reflect the fact that it has perceived the extreme danger of the impasse situation created by the Israeli authorities' stubborn reluctance to face reality and these steps also reflect Washington's desire to build a dialogue for this reason so as to seek ways to overcome the situation.

An extraordinary summit conference was convened in Algiers to work out the Arab world's reaction to the Palestinian uprising, including joint proposals to settle the crisis in the region. One can consider its main result to be the reconstruction of a united Arab stand regarding Palestinian rights, the full exercise of which is a key aspect of a just, lasting solution. The conference confirmed its recognition of the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian Arab people and also restated the determination to convene an international conference on the Near East with full powers under the aegis of the United Nations with the aim of achieving a comprehensive settlement of the conflict.

Naturally, the Arab leaders could not fail to express an opinion on the U.S. diplomatic efforts of recent months. Their verdict was unanimous—these efforts are still geared primarily to protecting Israeli interests and are hostile to the Arabs as a whole and the national rights of the Palestinians in particular. The decisions of the Algiers meeting suggest a clear conclusion: There will be no peace in the Near East without scrupulous fulfillment of all UN resolutions on the Palestinian problem.

Agreeing, like others, with these conclusions, the London FINANCIAL TIMES notes that the future U.S. Administration "must learn some lessons from this meeting (in Algiers—K.G.), and the first of them is the need to involve the Palestinians in the negotiating process." In the past everyone would have put the matter on hold at this point for the next 18 months. First, because the presidential elections are going to be held in the United States in November, and their results will be directly affected by the state of U.S.-Israeli relations. Second, because the new administration will have to be given approximately a year to work out its approach to the problem.

Yes, this is usually what happened in the past. But now, I believe, we have to work on the basis that the Arab-Israeli conflict has reached the point where the task of reaching a solution as soon as possible has become an urgent requirement of the time. It is obvious that the persisting explosive situation in the Near East is at variance with the general improvements noted in international relations. To say nothing of the fact that this situation does not meet the interests of the peoples living in this region. That is why I believe there is no point in approaching the problem on the basis of old criteria.

Especially as certain positive elements, which have already been remarked, have now appeared in the U.S. stance. For example, the Syrian newspaper TISHRIN has described as "a hint of realism" the statement by Secretary of State Shultz that Jerusalem (he evidently means East Jerusalem—K.G.), the West Bank, the Gaza Strip, and the Golan Heights constitute occupied territories and must be made the subject of talks between Israel and the Arabs. The newspaper emphasized that by saying this the U.S. Administration's spokesman has made it clear that there is a possibility of progress in the U.S. position. In this respect, TISHRIN pointed out, Washington must go further in its initiatives and come closer to the idea of convening an international conference with full powers under UN aegis which will involve all interested sides, including the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

Indeed, in this respect there is obviously a need to try to work out a common denominator—without losing momentum—in favor of a just, comprehensive Near East settlement based on the principles of international law, the UN Charter and decisions, and a balance of interests of all sides. All this presupposes that their land, currently occupied by the Israelis, will be returned to the Arabs, the Palestinian Arab people will be guaranteed the right to self-determination, and all states and peoples in the region will be given the opportunity to develop freely and live in safety within internationally recognized, guaranteed borders.

But where and how can this whole range of complex problems be best resolved? The Soviet Union long ago made a proposal on this score—to convene an international conference under the UN aegis which will involve

all interested sides and also the permanent members of the UN Security Council. It now seems to have virtually universal recognition as the best possible means of working out a fair Near East settlement. The participants in such a conference will have the opportunity to collectively or individually submit proposals and recommendations aimed at reaching mutually acceptable accords. This forum also intends that the participants collaborate with each other in the most diverse ways—at plenary sessions and in bilateral and multilateral committees.

The way the situation is now evolving shows that the Arab countries will recognize Israel's right to exist and its right to security if the Israelis vacate the occupied territories. At the Algiers conference the Arab leaders confirmed their commitment to achieving a peaceful solution of the Near East conflict by holding an international conference under UN aegis and with the participation of all interested sides, including the PLO, on an equitable basis. The socialist countries, the Nonaligned Movement, and the EEC are all in agreement with this.

The task now is obviously to make the most of this favorable situation and set the wheels of negotiation in motion as rapidly as possible, because the serious problem of a Near East settlement will not disappear from the agenda for the new administrations that will appear in the United States and Israel after the November elections.

Petrovskiy Discusses Mideast Conference, Gulf
JN1906080588 Abu Dhabi AL-ITTIHAD AL-USBU'I
in Arabic 16 Jun 88 p 11

["Text" of interview with Vladimir Petrovskiy, Soviet deputy minister of foreign affairs, by Anita Sunkudjian; date and place not given]

[Text] AL-ITTIHAD: How would you describe the current and dangerous arms race which is taking place in both the USSR and Arab states?

Petrovskiy: The regional arms race is part of the comprehensive arms race which is currently taking place throughout the world. Nowadays, we believe that it is very important to establish a comprehensive security system which would give us the opportunity to reach political solutions to all existing problems. Hence, it is very important to end the arms race on earth and to end it in all regions. This is what makes struggle against the arms race very important on both the horizontal and vertical levels. In other words, it is necessary to end the arms race which takes the form of storing weapons on earth. This is what I mean by the term "the vertical arms race". Likewise, it is necessary to end the horizontal arms race which is the production of weapons.

AL-ITTIHAD: Now that the Middle East has surface-to-surface ballistic missiles, what is your opinion of the security situation in the Middle East? Have the Middle East states become secure with this new development?

Petrovskiy: This is also a problem that deserves to be given due attention. During the Moscow summit, we exchanged views [with the Americans] on this issue. Consultations must continue. We must take into account that this is not a factor which helps improve the situation in the Middle East.

AL-ITTIHAD: Numerically speaking, the Soviets are supplying the region with large quantities of weapons, especially missiles. What is your comment on this?

Petrovskiy: Thinking of the issue in terms of numbers reflects a mistaken attitude. What is very important nowadays is to take measures. The USSR proposed practical measures in this regard. These measures provided for stopping arms sales. The sooner the negotiations in this regard begin, the better their chances of success. What has special importance in this regard are the arms sales and the increase in the very sophisticated types of weapons being sold.

AL-ITTIHAD: The Arabs view Israel as a party that poses a nuclear threat in the Middle East. What is the effect of this serious factor on Israeli-USSR relations at a time when the Soviets are paying great attention to disarmament and world peace?

Petrovskiy: We agree with the opinion voiced at the United Nations regarding Israel's nuclear ambitions. We voted in favor of this resolution and our stand on this issue is well-known. We are against the acquisition of nuclear weapons by any state. We believe that the treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons is the basis which can guide our endeavors and steps in this regard.

AL-ITTIHAD: The permanent Soviet representative at the United Nations said, during the last two sessions of the UN Security Council, that Israel is pursuing a policy of state terrorism. Why then do you seek to reward Israel by working to restore diplomatic relations with it when you say that it is pursuing a policy of state terrorism?

Petrovskiy: We are not talking about this issue. Nowadays, we are considering and stressing an issue which we consider to be very important; namely, the convening of the Middle East international peace conference which would comprehensively resolve this conflict. I am aware that one aspect of this conference will tackle the military situation in the region. Once this conference begins its meetings, the process of normalizing USSR-Israeli relations will begin.

AL-ITTIHAD: What is your comment on the Soviet statements issued in response to Israel's use of missiles that can reach your territory? And is this prompted by a desire to take revenge?

Petrovskiy: I do not know anything about Soviet statements issued in this regard, as there have been no such Soviet statements issued on this issue. We said that this is a serious development. As for the test firing of the Jericho-2 missile, no statement has been issued on it.

AL-ITTIHAD: What is your response to the Israeli-U.S. research cooperation in the Star Wars program (SDI) in which Israel will carry out research on the anti-ballistic missile Arrow?

Petrovskiy: Our stand on the Star Wars program is well known. We have explained that what interests us today is to prevent an arms race in space. That is the essence of our view on the issue. Of course, there must be no violation of the existing understanding and the UN resolutions that call on states not to deploy weapons in space.

AL-ITTIHAD: Does Israel's research in this new defense field or missile conflict with U.S.-Soviet arms agreements?

Petrovskiy: I do not know exactly what facts it wants. However, what is very important is that we must abide by the laws. The laws enacted by the United States and the commitments to which it tried to adhere are basically connected with two issues: First, not to possess any anti-ballistic missile system that covers the various parts of the country. Second, it is very important not to do anything that is likely to allow the possession of weapons in outer space.

AL-ITTIHAD: According to one of the conclusions on the Moscow summit both sides emerged empty-handed with regard to regional issues, despite the fact that there was a full exchange of views?

Petrovskiy: I do not agree with the interpretation that they came out empty handed. They want necessary understanding to work for the resolution of regional conflicts and the regional situation. There was an exchange of views on many regional issues, including the Middle East. We explained our stand; namely, that it has now become possible to work for a solution to that problem. That is merely a step, but it is a step toward the development of dialogue on that regional situation, and toward understanding the need to end regional conflicts—while of course taking into consideration the special characteristics of these regions and the interests of the people that live there.

AL-ITTIHAD: Can you explain the Soviet stand on an Arab-Israeli settlement? Taking into consideration the Moscow summit, the meetings Soviet officials held with Arabs and Israelis during the UN session on disarmament, the meetings between Soviet ministers and the UN secretary general, Shultz' latest Middle East tour, and the Arab summit in Algiers, how close are we now to drawing up a mechanism for convening the Middle East conference?

Petrovskiy: I have the feeling that the process is developing toward the convening of such a conference. We now have the greatest degree of international consensus on the matter, and there has never been such a consensus in the past. The question now is how to control the old concepts that still prevent a total consensus on the matter so that convening the conference can be within a practical framework. I believe the circumstances have improved and are now favorable.

AL-ITTIHAD: How have they become favorable, and what are the obstacles?

Petrovskiy: One of the obstacles is the Israeli stand. The Israeli stand was mentioned during the meeting between the Soviet and Israeli foreign ministers. I still hope wisdom—which is not the monopoly of any particular person but belongs to all the people of the world—will prevail in Israeli policies.

AL-ITTIHAD: How can Israel be pushed to attend the international conference? Is this one of the tasks to be performed by both the United States and the USSR?

Petrovskiy: We believe that all the parties concerned must participate in the international Middle East peace conference. Of course, Israel must participate in it. It is very important for this country, as it is for other countries, to attend this conference. Besides, it is also important for the representatives of the Palestinian people to attend this conference.

AL-ITTIHAD: Who can bring the Israelis to this conference?

Petrovskiy: No. [as published] I believe that the countries which are maintaining a dialogue with Israel, especially those that are linked to it through ties of alliance called the strategic alliance, can influence it.

Petrovskiy [as published]: In this regard, we view with complete satisfaction what has been said by U.S. State Department Secretary George Shultz. He understands the need to convene such a conference. This understanding would increase the chances of taking practical measures to bring about the convening of this conference.

AL-ITTIHAD: Has the United States demonstrated any further flexibility beyond the one that was displayed in previous meetings on the Soviet stand toward the issue of convening the conference?

Petrovskiy: We will see this with the passage of time. We will see this flexibility or this degree of flexibility with the passage of time. What we currently see are some signals showing that they [the Americans] understand the importance of convening this international conference.

AL-ITTIHAD: What is the Soviet flexibility toward the conference? We heard that the Soviets displayed enthusiastic eagerness to demonstrate further flexibility?

Petrovskiy: Our new political thought, which is currently developing in our country, is also being applied to our policy regarding this region. This new political thought stresses the urgent need to employ political tools and means to find this solution. We have made it clear that we are against the opinion which says that this conference must serve as a type of umbrella, or intrigue, or anything of the like. However, it must provide the opportunity to develop the multi-faceted peace process through the holding of collective and bilateral negotiations.

In other words, it will be an expanded conference in which each part of the process will enrich the other parts. However, it remains to be said that the essence of this conference will be the collective negotiations. Of course, what must be stressed, from the viewpoint of the new political thought and that of the new perspective regarding this issue, is that we are looking forward to securing a balance of the interests of the parties which will attend this conference.

AL-ITTIHAD: What is meant by the term "the ongoing gathering" which was used to describe the conference? Does this mean that the Soviets have backed down on their demand for a fully-empowered conference, which means an effective one in favor of this ongoing gathering?

Petrovskiy: We believe that this conference should be an effective one that involves an ongoing process. However, we have not used the term "the ongoing gathering" to refer to the conference. We know that the U.S. side uses the term "the ongoing gathering". But we believe that the important point that must be stressed is that this conference must be an effective international conference that would provide the framework for conducting collective as well as bilateral talks which will take the form of holding continuous contacts. To the best of my knowledge, any effective conference should be a fully-empowered one. The most important thing in this regard is to provide the element of continuity and to secure a collective participation which is the backbone of this conference. The convening of the conference must be based on the principle of continuity in many of the meetings and contacts to be held. As you know, the other negotiating process has evolved over many long years. The Helsinki negotiations, where bilateral and collective contacts were held, are suitable in this regard.

AL-ITTIHAD: One of the most important Arab officials has described the Soviet stand as highly advanced, developed and very reasonable. What does that mean?

Petrovskiy: I agree with him that the Soviet stand is advanced and reasonable because it takes into consideration the interests of all the parties concerned and opens

the way to holding all kinds of negotiations. Its basic objective is to create the opportunity for a comprehensive solution to the Middle East question including its crux, the Palestine question. That is why I say it is advanced and reasonable.

AL-ITTIHAD: CPSU Secretary General Mikhail Gorbachev said in Moscow that "other forms of discussion" can be put forward at the conference. Is that a reference to bilateral and collective discussions?

Petrovskiy: Yes, there can be a resort to various forms of discussion at the conference.

AL-ITTIHAD: Do you believe it is possible to arrive at a common U.S.-Soviet stand, or is it only necessary to achieve progress, such as increasing Soviet-U.S. cooperation? Is it time for the United Nations to make a move? Who should make the next step?

Petrovskiy: We are holding a dialogue with the United Nations. However, we believe the United Nations must carry out an effective role in this issue. The permanent members of the Security Council as well as the UN secretary general can play an important part.

AL-ITTIHAD: What constructive role can the Soviet Union play in the Middle East, and will that entail Soviet influence over Syria?

Petrovskiy: A constructive role in understanding the need for the participation of all the sides in the conference. That is a very important factor in order to achieve a peaceful and comprehensive solution to the issue.

AL-ITTIHAD: Do you feel the United States has failed in fulfilling its commitments and bringing about a comprehensive Israeli withdrawal from the Arab territories? If so, is the Soviet Union now committed to not insisting on Israeli withdrawal as a condition for the restoration of its relations with Israel?

Petrovskiy: One of the most important elements in the conference is the restoration of, or the withdrawal of the Israelis from all the occupied territory. That is an important element in and a basic condition for the conference's success. Such issues are approved at the conference. It will be necessary at the conference to discuss all the problems arising from the situation in the region now. Therefore, the Arabs must regain all their occupied territory, and the Palestinians must gain the right to self-determination, and Israel—like other area countries—must have the right to live in peace. All that must be achieved at the conference.

AL-ITTIHAD: The Soviet Union explained to Israel in the past that it must correct its previous policy of aggression against Arab territory by withdrawing from these territories. Now your minister has stated that your only condition is that Israel joins the peace process?

Petrovskiy: But to join the peace conference for what? Precisely in order to achieve such tasks, to liquidate the results of aggression. That is the objective of the conference, to bring about a comprehensive solution to the issue that will include all the topics you mentioned. That is the essence of the problem.

AL-ITTIHAD: Do you believe that the United States will allow the PLO attend the conference, either through a joint delegation or an independent one?

Petrovskiy: It is impossible to envisage a conference without PLO participation, as one of the basic issues to be tackled by this conference is the Palestine question. Another issue pertains to the form of PLO representation. The decision regarding this issue rests with the PLO which has the final say in this regard.

AL-ITTIHAD: Has the Soviet side not bolstered Shamir's stands through the high-level meeting it held with him prior to the Israeli elections?

Petrovskiy: We know that this was not our objective. We are doing nothing other than maintaining the existing dialogue between us and Israel. We held meetings with other prime ministers. Recently, we have held a meeting with Shamir. We believe that the contacts held at the United Nations are routine and normal.

AL-ITTIHAD: Was this meeting with Shamir a condition laid by the U.S. side for the Soviet side to meet if progress is to be made in the process?

Petrovskiy: You have continued to refer to concepts pertaining to the balance of power. No, our work emanates from other principles, from the principles enshrined in a new political thought that paves the way for the attainment of this objective.

AL-ITTIHAD: The Soviet meeting with Shamir was held at a time when the uprising was continuing. Israel has been the target of criticism by the entire world because of the way it is handling the uprising. What do you have to say about this?

Petrovskiy: We have clarified our stands and viewpoints to Shamir. I think this meeting provided us with a good opportunity to have firsthand knowledge about each other's viewpoints.

AL-ITTIHAD: Do you expect great changes in USSR-Israeli relations as a result of the forthcoming CPSU congress?

Petrovskiy: I do not know what Shamir's stands are. Our stand has remained unchanged. Shamir has had the chance to clearly know this stand. Once the Israelis demonstrate a readiness to attend the conference and once the conference begins its meetings, the issue of

normalizing USSR-Israeli relations will be raised. The basic things must come first. And with this, I mean an international Middle East peace conference.

AL-ITTIHAD: Shamir has unequivocally announced that he does not intend to change his stand on the peace conference.

Petrovskiy: I still believe in the proverb which says that you cannot maintain the status of the soldier who alleges that he is heading in the right direction and that the whole division is heading in the wrong one. The entire international community believes that the convening of the international conference is a must.

AL-ITTIHAD: Do you believe that the international community has at present specified its conditions for the convening of the international conference?

Petrovskiy: Nowadays, we can depend on the UN General Assembly resolutions, as they provide the framework for this conference.

AL-ITTIHAD: Where does the Middle East lie in the Soviet priority list of regional conflicts?

Petrovskiy: The Middle East conflict is one of the pressing issues that need urgent resolutions. As a matter of fact, the Middle East is a very hot spot. It is very important to employ the momentum and the strong moves which have emerged in the wake of the political resolution of the Afghan conflict to begin tackling the Middle East issue.

AL-ITTIHAD: How in your view will the future of the Middle East appear as a result of the Palestinian uprising?

Petrovskiy: The Palestinian uprising has drawn attention to the importance of an early solution to the problem. It shows that the Palestine question is the core of the conflict, and it is necessary to resolve that conflict. The longer the issue remains without a solution the more unstable the area and the more serious the situation and the greater the threat it poses not only to the region but also to the entire world. That is the reason for the need to obtain the best benefits from the uprising. It is necessary to begin to act. That is another factor in favor of expediting the convening of the international conference.

When the conference is convened and when results are achieved, I believe the Middle East will be one of the securest places in the world, and will be able to play a very important role in world culture. At one time I was in the region and I believe it has one of the best human civilizations. The Arab states have accomplished many achievements for world culture. I believe its contributions in all fields will increase tangibly, for the participation of all area countries in international affairs will be more productive.

AL-ITTIHAD: Do you envisage the establishment of a Palestinian state? Are your views the same as the views of the Arabs at the Algiers summit?

Petrovskiy: What is important is that the Palestinians should have the opportunity to exercise their right to self-determination. We are prepared to respect the choice of the Palestinian people. That is also a strong element in the new political thinking: Respect for the choice of peoples.

AL-ITTIHAD: Do you believe the new Arab unity embodied at the Algiers summit can lead us to peace?

Petrovskiy: When states get together the resulting Arab unity makes it easier to solve the various problems, and makes it easier to solve the serious problems that precede the conference including the question of self-determination, the withdrawal of Israeli forces, and the question of the peaceful existence of Israel and other area states. That is a basic factor and must be taken into consideration by the other side, that is, Israel. Therefore, it is very important that there should be a united stand.

AL-ITTIHAD: Why in your view has neither Iraq nor Iran accepted the solution proposed at the United Nations when both of them point to their desire to end the war?

Petrovskiy: There is now an opportunity to end the Iraq-Iran war—which tops our list of priorities—by supporting the mission of the UN secretary general. The plan proposed by the UN secretary general provides an opportunity to find a solution to the issue on the basis of safeguarding the interests of all the parties concerned. That is the only way to achieve a solution, and I do not see any other alternative. It is this reason that moves me to emphasize the need for all the Security Council members to work in the same direction. They realize there is no other way, and consequently they support this endeavor, and that is extremely important.

AL-ITTIHAD: Have the UN secretary general's efforts been fully exhausted?

Petrovskiy: No, no, I do not believe they have been exhausted. Greater attention must be given to the UN secretary general's efforts. He has the full authority given to him by all the Security Council members, including the permanent members of the Security Council.

Primakov Views Current Mideast, Gulf Issues
PM2006144188 London AL-HAWADITH
in Arabic 17 Jun 88 pp 33-35

[Interview with Yevgeniy Primakov, director of World Economics and International Relations Institute, by Raghdah Dirgham in Moscow; date not given]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] **AL-HAWADITH:** U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz made a third tour of the region immediately after the Moscow summit. He

announced that he would make another tour. The U.S. position claims that the Soviet Union has not yet clarified some points the Americans inquired about. What are these points?

Primakov: They want us to clarify our stands? What we want is for them to clarify their stand. We need to know their true position on a settlement to the Palestinian problem, which is the crux of the Middle East problem. Until now the Americans have avoided the problem of recognizing the PLO as the true force capable of representing the Palestinians at the negotiating table. And until now the Americans have used various excuses regarding this issue, like, for instance, Israel's disapproval, and so on. Anyhow, many things are still unacceptable to one party or the other.

AL-HAWADITH: The Americans say that the Soviets insist on an international conference enjoying powers to impose, dictate, or veto solutions. Is this true?

Primakov: What we insist on is an integrated and well-connected deal. This is the only thing we insist on, since our past experience prompts us to insist on a comprehensive solution in order to prevent isolated deals. The Americans are merely using the term comprehensive solution, which, according to our experience, is the only solution that can achieve peace in the Middle East.

AL-HAWADITH: What about Palestinian representation in the negotiations? It is being said that you do not insist on representation being confined to the PLO.

Primakov: In my opinion, the question has nothing to do with tangible physical representation of the Palestinian leadership in the negotiations. It is something different: Can the Americans recognize the PLO as the main and sole power capable of making a decision regarding the Palestinian position? If the Americans are willing to accept this, I believe that there will be no other obstacles in the way of forming a delegation.

AL-HAWADITH: If I understand you correctly, you mean U.S. recognition of the principle itself, not necessarily tangible physical PLO representation in the delegation. Is this what you mean?

Primakov: Why the principle only? What I mean is the need to deal with that force. In what form? That is unimportant. The important thing is for the Americans to understand that the PLO is the true force capable of making decisions on behalf of the Palestinians.

AL-HAWADITH: The Americans announced that they would not deal with the PLO until it complied with U.S. terms, foremost among which is recognition of Resolution 242 and the renunciation of violence.

Primakov: I have met many times with Yasir 'Arafat and other PLO leaders. And I do not believe they are intransigent or rigid to the point of being unwilling to

display the desired flexibility. But they do not want to display such flexibility on an isolated basis or from one side. All they want is for the other side to make some moves toward them. So, if that side is not ready to do that, nothing will be achieved. And here the Palestinians are proving once again to everyone and to Israeli public opinion that the Palestinian element is still unresolved, that the current situation in the occupied territories cannot remain as it is. This means that the Israelis must reach a settlement. With whom? For many years they have tried to be partners with the Palestinian inhabitants, but they have failed. This means that if they are realistic they must then think about a formula involving the PLO's playing a role in securing a peaceful solution. What formula? This depends on a number of complex elements. But the main thing is to include the PLO in the process, otherwise it will face an unclear situation, achieving no settlement or breakthrough.

AL-HAWADITH: The Americans oppose the idea of the Palestinians' right to self-determination, on the basis that such a principle indicates the need to establish an independent state. For your part, you call for the right to self-determination but not necessarily the establishment of an independent state. Did you discuss with the Americans a self-determination formula that does not necessarily mean the establishment of a state?

Primakov: I do not believe that we are ready to discuss the future of the Palestinian people in detail with the Americans. According to our understanding, the right to self-determination means exploring all possibilities, including the establishment of a Palestinian state. But how? And what are the aspirations of the Palestinian people? Do they want a confederation with Jordan, or do they want federation? That is a Palestinian decision. In any case, the Palestinian people have the right to establish their own state. Do the Palestinians want to implement this idea? It is up to them.

AL-HAWADITH: Are the Soviet and U.S. stands too distant for the gap between them ever to be filled? Or do both fronts believe that parallel efforts can be exerted to secure a unified stand in the near future?

Primakov: Let me answer you like this: If the Americans are ready to accept a true international conference representing no umbrella for isolated deals—I mean a conference that will work for a long period of time, since we, obviously, cannot achieve everything immediately—we can help in resolving some of the existing problems. And then it is possible for us to work together. If the Americans are willing to do this, we will support them. Why should we not? But if they want the conference to be merely an umbrella for isolated deals, we will of course not support them. Why should we? Would we support those who want to settle the present problem in the occupied territories merely to extricate themselves from the dilemma they are in and delay a solution? No.

The true and only solution to which the Soviet Union would contribute is one taking into account the interests of the Palestinians, the Arabs, and the Israeli people as well. [passage omitted]

AL-HAWADITH: Is the Israeli consular delegation's visit to the Soviet Union a step toward the resumption of diplomatic relations with Israel?

Primakov: No, of course not. If we wanted to resume diplomatic relations, we would not need such a consular exchange. We could simply announce this. We believe that diplomatic relations can and should be resumed, but via the political process.

AL-HAWADITH: Let us talk about Lebanon. The Americans are playing an active part regarding Lebanon, which they call the postman's role among the Lebanese parties themselves and with Syria. Is the Soviet Union playing an active role in Lebanon, or have you left that arena to the Americans?

Primakov: I do not believe that even the Americans can play an active role in Lebanon. Nor do I believe that the Syrians need a mediator between them and the Lebanese forces (laughing). What you say is really laughable. I have spent a long time examining this issue, so I am fully acquainted with the situation: The Syrians are capable of doing anything in Lebanon. They are capable of making contact with anyone they want. They do not need U.S. mediation.

AL-HAWADITH: In your opinion, was Syria's decision to enter the southern suburb [of Beirut] a wise one, or does this pose a danger to Syria?

Primakov: Until now the Syrians have been very wise in their policy toward Lebanon. They are anxious not to go beyond the "boundaries." They are acting within limits. For instance, they deploy their forces in specific areas, but only after the necessary political work is done. They are working in a way that shows them seeking stability in the situation. And this is clear in their attitude. [passage omitted]

AL-HAWADITH: Will recent Iraqi military achievements, such as the recapture of Al-Faw and other important areas, reflect on diplomatic efforts and stands toward diplomatic proposals for an end to the Gulf war?

Primakov: I do not believe that the situation has changed. Regardless of any move from the two parties or any results in the military arena, I do not believe there is a military solution to the present situation. These are temporary results; the solution is political. [passage omitted]

AL-HAWADITH: What stage have Soviet-Saudi contacts reached regarding the normalization of relations? Can diplomatic relations be established between you in the near future?

Primakov: We are ready. We have made some contacts, including the visit by the Saudi foreign minister to the Soviet Union, which was the first in the history of our relations. [passage omitted]

AL-HAWADITH: What about recent rapprochement between the PDRY and the YAR? Did the Soviet Union play a role in that rapprochement?

Primakov: I do not believe that we played any role in that rapprochement. And if we could have a positive influence in this regard, we would not hesitate. But we did not play an active role in that rapprochement.

AL-HAWADITH: Speaking of influence, is the Soviet Union using its influence at present to stop third parties from sending arms to Iran, with the knowledge that the Americans are accusing the Soviet Union of selling arms to Iran?

Primakov: That is untrue.

AL-HAWADITH: Via third parties?

Primakov: That is untrue. And I categorically deny it.

AL-HAWADITH: Are you using your influence with the states selling arms to Iran?

Primakov: We have discussed this issue with a number of those who can be considered friends of ours. But we are not in a position to do anything. For instance, the United States is against selling arms to Iran, but can it stop Israel's activities in this regard?

AL-HAWADITH: Are these activities still continuing?

Primakov: Yes. I believe they still are. Israel's considerations in this regard are purely political. As for others selling arms to Iran, their considerations are not only political, but commercial as well. So how can they be influenced? Well, we are making efforts. What I would like to reiterate is that no Soviet arms are being sent to Iran.

AL-HAWADITH: And, in your opinion, are the Chinese considerations political or commercial?

Primakov: Ask them. I want our relations with China to develop; for that reason I do not want to direct any criticism at them. So ask them yourself. [passage omitted]

Akhromeyev Holds 'Friendly Talks' With Algerian
PM2006152588 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 17 Jun 88 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "On an Official Visit"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] On 16 June Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, received Major General A. Belhouchet, member of the National Liberation Front Central Committee Politburo and chief of staff of the National People's Army of the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria, who is on an official visit to the Soviet Union. Questions of mutual interest were discussed during friendly talks.

M. Yala, Algerian ambassador to the USSR, participated in the talks.

Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev gave a dinner in honor of Major General A. Belhouchet. [Passage omitted]

Israeli 'Terrorism' as 'State Policy' Condemned
LD2006131988 Moscow TASS in English 1245 GMT
20 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—TASS political analyst Yevgeniy Babenko writes:

On June 18 Israeli soldiers shot dead Ra'id al-Haj, 17, in the Palestinian refugee camp Khan Yunis near the city of Gaza. This young Palestinian has become the 368th victim of the invaders' terror since the start of the general uprising on the Israeli-occupied territories last December, which has been going on since then.

An Israeli military spokesman was forced to admit an attempt of a collective suicide by 72 Palestinians at the prison in the city of Beersheba. The desperate Palestinians used this action as the last resort to express their protest against brutal treatment of prisoners by occupiers.

These are only two dispatches from the Middle East region coming in the past few days. Literally each of such reports contains new facts on bloodshed perpetrated by the Israeli soldiery, new figures about the killed, wounded and tortured in jails. Each such information becomes another "stroke" in a tragic picture of everyday terror committed by the Tel Aviv authorities against innocent residents of the occupied lands. Young people are being annihilated. This is also true of children, women and the aged who are also suffering from inhuman privations.

The Israeli top crust, entirely responsible for numerous crimes against human life and dignity on Arab lands is stubbornly seeking to put facts upside down when they accuse Palestinians of... terrorism.

Not a single reasonable person in the world with clear conscience will have an idea of putting an equation mark between terrorism and the difficult and long-standing struggle of Palestinians for their national rights. On the contrary, it is common knowledge for a long time that official Israel, with an overseas blessing, elevated terrorism in its most diverse manifestations to the level of state policy.

The other day a major general, commander of Israeli troops in the so-called central zone of occupied territories, admitted that the situation on Israeli-occupied lands would never be the same as it had been before the general uprising of Arab population. Palestinians have regained confidence in their own forces and therefore Israel stands at the outset of a protracted struggle, he said. Indeed, the just struggle of the Arab people of occupied territories is going on.

East Europe

Journalist Views Impact of Polish Strikes
PM2106082588 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 15 Jun 88 Second Edition p 5

[A. Makhov interview with Zbigniew Wrobel, TRYBUNA LUDU representative in Gdansk: "Ten Lost Days"; date not given]

[Text] Zbigniew Wrobel, my colleague from Poland, looked like a man who had just returned from vacation.

"Where did you pick up that tan, Zbigniew? In the Carpathians?"

"During the strike at the Gdansk shipyard. The newspaper demanded a daily briefing, yet there was nothing to report. The strikers' pickets didn't let journalists into the enterprise. I had to spend hours standing in the sun as I waited for events..."

Our newspaper reported on the strike which paralyzed the shipyards at Poland's main port for several days. I took this opportunity to ask Wrobel, who is the Gdansk representative of TRYBUNA LUDU, the organ of the PZPR Central Committee, to talk in greater detail about the recent events he witnessed.

[Makhov] Zbigniew, people sometimes try to portray the wave of strikes which swept the country as a response to the not entirely successful implementation of economic reform...

[Wrobel] There is no simple answer to your question. The economic situation in the country is indeed grave. The pressure of a multibillion-dollar debt weighs heavy on the Polish national economy. Prices are rising quite rapidly. Wages don't always keep pace with them, although the government is doing everything possible to

eliminate the discrepancies. In short, the situation in the economy has had a certain impact on the strikes. But nonetheless it is not the main reason.

Now even among opposition forces there is growing understanding that the imposition of martial law in Poland 6 years ago was the only possible way of pulling the country out of the crisis. The dregs of "Solidarity" broke up into several small but vociferous groupings, which seek every means to remind us of their existence. One is notorious—it incites working people to strike. This is how the conflicts in Nowa Huta and later those at the Gdansk shipyard began. I will cite the example of Gdansk. Of the strikers' five demands, four were of a political nature and were voiced at someone else's prompting. For instance, the slogan of freedom for political prisoners—of which there are none in Poland in principle—was put forward. Incidentally, at first fewer than 100 of the enterprise's 1,500 workers came out on strike. Nevertheless this did for some time paralyze the shipyard's work.

[Makhov] While leafing through the foreign press of the last month, I noticed that most Western newspapers stubbornly drew parallels between the events of August 1980 and the present Gdansk strike...

[Wrobel] Yes, many people would like to make the same comparison but, to their chagrin, nothing similar occurred. Although the elements in the parallels were a perfect match: the strike took place at the same Gdansk shipyard where "Solidarity" was born, just as 8 years ago flowers appeared at the gates of the yard during the strike and pictures of the Pope were put up.

But this, perhaps, is where the similarity with August 1980 ends. Then in August the strike emerged from the gates of the shipyard and affected the entire shoreline and later also spread to the rest of the country's territory. This was a clear demonstration of the tenseness of the situation then. Present events at the shipyard occurred in a vacuum, so to speak. The townspeople were only interested in it in the first 3 days. Then it only evoked interest in journalists, and the strikers kept totally silent. By the way, there is yet another difference between this and 1980. In 1980 the strikers took advantage of any opportunity to give the press their viewpoint. This time there was nothing for the strikers to talk about. The rabble-rousers counted on the administration's resolving the conflict using arbitrary methods. However, the authorities showed restraint and the strikers achieved nothing. On the 10th day the strike stopped of its own accord. Incidentally, those very political forces that I mentioned made a number of attempts to set the workers against the authorities at other enterprises also. But here too they ended in defeat. Here is a typical example. A single strike with purely economic slogans was called at Bydgoszcz. Walesa, the former "Solidarity" leader, offered the strikers his help. He received the following response: "Thank you very much, but we have nothing in common with your organization."

[Makhov] Yet, Zbigniew, in your opinion, what spurred these events to take place in late April and May in Poland? Where did the political slogans come from at that time, if the very political structure of society was not undergoing substantial change?

[Wrobel] Regarding the immutability of the political structure, I do not agree with you on this point. The democratic process is in full swing in the country. A number of political parties besides the PZPR are operating. Trade unions have ceased to perform the functions of an appendage of the administration and the ruling party. People who do not agree with government policy have the opportunity to openly express their opinion, even at the highest level. For instance, both Communists and nonparty members and even former "Solidarity" members—that is practically all political forces within the country—are represented on the republic's Council of State Consultative Council. Heated debates often take place there. That is, as you can see, democracy in our country has come a very long way.

Similar democratic processes are also gathering momentum in other socialist countries, notably in your country. One gets the impression that certain Western circles are afraid of these processes: The stereotypes evolved over decades regarding the closed nature of socialist society are being smashed. Socialism as a system is becoming more attractive. You ask why the situation in Poland got worse precisely in April-May. Many people in our country believe that these events were instigated by certain external forces right on the eve of your party conference, where the question of the further democratization of Soviet society will be resolved.

IZVESTIYA Reports PZPR Plenum on Reform
PM1706144588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
17 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "PZPR Central Committee Plenum Ends"]

[Text] Warsaw, 16 Jun—A plenum of the PZPR Central Committee, devoted to the party's tasks on the further deepening of economic and political reforms and on cadre policy, has ended its work here. Its participants discussed a report on these questions by the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and adopted a resolution.

W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, delivered a closing speech at the plenum. Today's world, he said, lives with the rhythm of profound and at times even amazing changes. The dynamics of the new thinking not only remove the threat of a global conflict but also outline the majestic horizons of the future and demolish rotten stereotypes.

The multiplicity of socialism's solutions and values has become a universal component of modern civilization. Our system, while fully preserving its specific features, is also acquiring in the process of development instruments

and methods that expand its potential and facilitate progress. At the same time, however, we have no wish to and cannot abandon even a single one of the values that constitute the essence and nature of socialism. Socialism has given Poland its newly gained independence, secure borders, and driving forces of development, and has first and foremost brought social justice on unprecedented scales. Our task is to consolidate these gains and to adapt them more fully to the difficult demands posed by modern times.

At the present stage the party must find and creatively consolidate its position in the development processes that have acquired new dynamics. The PZPR is taking on a dual role in the course of the implementation of economic transformations. On the one hand, it is the initiator and main political guarantor of reform. Being implemented under such difficult conditions, this reform demands high discipline, a sense of responsibility, and often even civic courage.

Poland is changing, and the party is changing with it. The converse also applies: The country is changing only to the extent that the processes of democratization advance within the PZPR, to the extent of the renewal of the work style of party structures and institutions. We are creating as we go along a new model of the leading role of the party, one that thinks courageously and adopts a critical attitude toward itself. Innovation, and modern thinking above all else, is as necessary for Poland as the air that we breathe.

W. Jaruzelski emphasized that it is necessary to learn a new approach to cadre policy. A party figure must be associated not only with the office he occupies, with various festive events, or with being on the presidiums of meetings; he must mainly be identified with a concept that is intelligible to citizens primarily at local level, with direct contacts with people, with the new work style.

The plenum decisions accurately define the tasks facing us, W. Jaruzelski said in conclusion. They can be briefly summed up as follows: A close link between high economic efficiency and a widely understandable social justice is the main goal of the PZPR's activity; the party must be in the vanguard of the renewal process; more trust in people means more trust in the party.

The plenum examined organizational matters. It granted the following requests for release in connection with reassignments: by M. Wozniak from the duties of member of the Politburo and secretary of the PZPR Central Committee; by W. Mokrzyszczak from the duties of member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo; by S. Bejger from the duties of candidate member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo; and by J. Baryla, T. Porebski, and S. Ciosek from the duties of secretary of the PZPR Central Committee. W. Jaruzelski thanked them for the work they have done.

W. Baka was elected member of the Central Committee, member of the Politburo, and secretary of the Central Committee; S. Ciosek was elected candidate member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo. M. Orzechowski and M. Rakowski, members of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo, were elected secretaries of the PZPR Central Committee, and B. Kolodziejczak was elected member of the PZPR Central Committee Secretariat.

The plenum granted the request by H. Bednarski to be released from the duties of chairman of the PZPR Central Committee Ideological Commission. This position and the functions of chairman of the Preparatory Commission for the Third All-Party Theoretical and Ideological Conference were assigned to M. Orzechowski.

Biryukova Receives CSSR Party Official
PM1906170588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] A delegation of party workers headed by V. Patek, member of the CPCZ Central Committee and director of a CPCZ Central Committee department, was in Moscow 13-17 June.

The Czechoslovak comrades familiarized themselves with the CPSU's activity in ensuring the practical implementation of the social policy defined by the 27th party congress. The delegation was received by A.P. Biryukova, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and had meetings at CPSU Central Committee departments and state and trade union organs.

PRAVDA Reports CPCZ Presidium Session
PM1706142988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
11 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "CPCZ Central Committee Presidium Session"]

[Text] Prague, 10 Jun—A CPCZ Central Committee Presidium session was held here today. As the disseminated report points out, the CPCZ Central Committee Presidium discussed and approved a draft program of ideological cooperation between the CPCZ and the CPSU.

It was emphasized that the common aims and directions of restructuring in both countries are creating favorable conditions for the further all-around development of ideological cooperation. The draft document, the report points out, characterizes urgent tasks of CPCZ-CPSU cooperation in the spheres of culture and education, social sciences, propaganda, ideological educational and mass political work, cooperation among the mass media, and sports and tourism.

Shishlin Writes on MSZMP Conference Results
AU1606203688 Budapest NEPSZABADSAG
in Hungarian 11 Jun 88 p 2

[Interview with Nikolay Shishlin, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department, by Peter Dunai, NEPSZABADSAG correspondent in Moscow: "A Sober Evaluation of the Situation and Realistic Decisions—Interview With Nikolay Shishlin After the MSZMP National Conference"]

[Text] People in the Soviet Union followed the MSZMP conference with great attention, especially since a CPSU national conference is to be held in Moscow at the end of June. The NEPSZABADSAG correspondent in Moscow interviewed Nikolay Shishlin on this subject.

[Shishlin] This great interest is understandable because the Hungarian experiences also drew attention from beyond Hungarian borders. Every socialist country—with its own particularities and solutions to problems—is a kind of sociological laboratory. Exchanges of opinions are a considerable contribution to the leadership of the other socialist countries. Of course, an increase in the economic difficulties of a country also arouses interest, and I am not only thinking of Hungary's growing debts. Although you have undisputed results, like the good performance of the flexible agricultural sector and certain industrial branches, development on the whole is slow.

The MSZMP conference has proved that the Hungarian Communists are evaluating the situation soberly and are relentlessly facing reality. Accordingly, the picture drawn at the conference is realistic and honest. In my opinion, this is the main circumstances needed to make the right decisions, because when a country's picture depicts wishes rather than reality, the decisions are suitable for an imaginary rather than a real situation.

In my opinion, the idea of renewing the leadership is correct. Policy is basically shaped by the needs of society, but also by people. The people who have joined the MSZMP Central Committee and Politburo carry weight in society. Therefore, one can only welcome these changes, and—I will add—also pay tribute to the several decades' work of Janos Kadar, an outstanding Hungarian Communist leader and a politician of great international repute.

I think that the endeavors aimed at deepening radical economic reform and which promote progress are correct. A socialist economy can only function well if its activities are determined by economic laws rather than by administrative rules.

Similar to the Soviet Union, the focus in Hungary is shifting to practical work and the implementation of stipulated goals. It is also true that the process of getting rid of old and obsolete modes of approach is not always painless. The first try is not always successful and

unfortunate decisions can thus be made. One should courageously get rid of them. The strength of the party lies also in recognizing and facing the mistakes of the present, not only those of the past.

[Dunai] Do you see any parallelism and coincidence between the recent MSZMP conference and the upcoming CPSU conference, and between the processes under way in the two countries?

[Shishlin] Restructuring, the process of revolutionary renewal under way in the Soviet Union is in many respects consonant with the activities of the Hungarian Communists. This is obvious in the economy, although the important particulars of each country lend the picture different shades. In my opinion, the main coincidence lies in the fact that both countries attach great importance to exploring the opportunities of the socialist market. The second similarity which is, perhaps, even more important than the first one is, that both Soviet and Hungarian Communists think it is impossible to improve the situation by only economic means. Economic reforms demand a thorough change in the political institutions in society. This change should be demonstrated by reassessing and reorganizing the leading and guiding role of the party. The main principle for the reorganization of the political structure should be that every socialist social institution be functional. There should be no "shopwindow" or "banner" institutions and those that exist should really function. This refers to councils, Parliament, parliamentary committees, and to institutions like the people's front. I also see many similarities in what we in the Soviet Union call a policy of openness and, within this, the role of the press.

In addition, the Communists of the two countries are connected by a healthy dissatisfaction with the achievements so far. Their wish is to eliminate the contradictions that have developed in socialist society and to develop the creative energy of socialism. The opportunities are there. It is only necessary to discover them and make the best use of them.

[Dunai] On the basis of what we have said so far, what is your opinion on the future of relations between the two countries and parties?

[Shishlin] The future is characterized by cooperation that is becoming increasingly richer. One can find still unexplored opportunities wherever one looks, starting with the economy. The opportunities and willingness for cooperation are inherent in bilateral and multilateral (CEMA) relations, but the mechanism for this does not exist. We will have to work patiently in this area and develop new functional structures in each branch. Pricing and the shift from the mystical transferrable ruble to the freely convertible ruble are the key issues.

We can also enrich our political cooperation, not only at the level of the Central Committee or other leading party body, but also on lower levels. In recent years there have

been positive examples of this. I also think that direct human relations are very important in the debates on intellectual, cultural, and ideological issues. In this respect, intellectual relations can comprise the roots from which political and economic cooperation can develop.

In the coming years, Soviet-Hungarian relations will further develop dynamically. Getting rid of conspicuous and noisy window-dressing elements, we will concentrate on concrete and practical elements. This will contribute to the implementation of the resolutions adopted by the MSZMP and CPSU conferences, and will also comprise an important element in strengthening of relations within the socialist world.

West Europe

Kamentsev, Finnish Minister at Plant Founding
PM2006140788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Joint Construction Project Started"]

[Text] Vsevolozhsk (Leningrad Oblast), 14 Jun—The symbolic first foundation stone of the future Leningrad Diesel Plant was today laid by V.M. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and K. Sorsa, Finnish deputy prime minister and foreign minister.

The enterprise is being built by the "Finstroy" joint-stock company together with Soviet construction and installation organizations. The first phase of the plant, planned for completion at the end of the 5-year plan, is intended to produce motors for large ships under license from the Finnish firm Wartsila.

French Socialist Justifies Nuclear Deterrent
PM2106090788 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
15 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Kovalenko dispatch: "Pierre Mauroy: Moving Further Along the Path of Disarmament"]

[Excerpts] Paris—Your correspondent asked Pierre Mauroy, first secretary of the French Socialist Party, to comment on the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, to express his viewpoint on prospects in the disarmament sphere, and to talk about the role France intends to play in improving East-West relations. This is what he said:

[Passage omitted] The Socialist Party believes that the elimination of intermediate-range missiles cannot complete the disarmament process and that it is insufficient to ensure security in Europe. The process must be continued by reducing chemical and conventional types

of weapons with a view to achieving equality of forces on the European Continent. France is interested, above all, in the successful outcome of the talks that have now been going on for a long time.

The substantial reduction of the two great powers' strategic arsenals is a precondition of France's participation in talks on this question, as President Mitterrand and our party's leaders have repeatedly mentioned.

These arsenals are so large and pack such destructive power that they bear no comparison with France's nuclear forces, which accord with its strategy of deterrence, of the weak against the strong. Their presence is justified by the very existence of inequality in nuclear and conventional forces between the medium power and the great power.

In his statements during the last meeting of NATO leaders President Mitterrand emphasized the need for France and its allies to take account of the Soviet leaders' proposals, as well as the progress at the Soviet-U.S. talks, in choosing our own policy in the security sphere. The president thereby displayed a flexible approach and readiness to utilize any opportunity and every new moment in the international arena to promote the cause of peace and security. [passage omitted]

MOSCOW NEWS Begins Publication in Britain
PM2106093988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
14 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent report under rubric "We Report Details": "British Launch of MOSCOW NEWS"]

[Excerpts] London—When I asked at the nearest kiosk whether there were any copies of MOSCOW NEWS, I was told that there had been, but that they had sold out.

As reported earlier, experimental publication of the English language version of MOSCOW NEWS has started in Britain. One of Britain's major publishing companies headed by Mr R. Maxwell has taken on this project. [passage omitted]

It is expected that by 1 October a joint enterprise will have been formed on the basis of cooperation between R. Maxwell and the NOVOSTI Press Agency. The British publisher has also expressed interest in publishing French and Spanish language editions of MOSCOW NEWS in the future.

Negotiations are now under way about the publication, on the basis of MOSCOW NEWS, of a digest of the Soviet political press for foreign countries, Ye. Yakovlev, chief editor of MOSCOW NEWS, in London in connection with the launching of the joint project, told me. A project for the complete retooling of MOSCOW NEWS production with Maxwell's assistance is now being drafted.

Briefs

Belgian Delegation Visits

Moscow June 20 TASS—Aleksandr Moku, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, received today a delegation of the Belgian Court of Cassation led by its first president, M. Chatel. The guests were told about the supreme body of state power in the country and the reorganization of its activities in line with the rejuvenation processes in all the sphere of life of Soviet society. [Text] [LD2106024588 Moscow TASS in English 0927 GMT 20 Jun 88]

Italian Agricultural Cooperation

Moscow June 20 TASS—The Soviet-Italian working group met for its second session today to discuss the results of the joint activity and prospects for developing ties in agriculture and related industries. Attending the session are leading specialists in agriculture, the food and other branches of the two countries' processing industries, Italian businessmen. The USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee and several Italian firms signed protocols on intentions to set up joint ventures in the Soviet Union. At issue are enterprises to process citrus plants, produce grape juice and work Persian lamb pelts. The firm Giza will take part in retooling cattle-rearing facilities in the USSR. [Excerpts] [LD2106025688 Moscow TASS in English 1353 GMT 20 Jun 88]

Parliamentarians Visit

Moscow June 20 TASS—A group of parliamentarians from European countries visited the USSR Supreme Soviet today. The group includes representatives of parliaments of Britain, Norway, France, Sweden and Europarlament. A conversation there touched upon perestroika in the USSR, international security and the consolidation of peace, humanitarian issues, as well as problems of East-West cultural cooperation and the growth of parliamentarians in this process. [Text] [LD2106024788 Moscow TASS in English 0924 GMT 20 Jun 88]

Latin America & Caribbean

Nicaragua's Ortega Cited on Economic Measures
LD1906113588 Moscow TASS in English 1045 GMT
19 Jun 88

[Text] Managua June 19 TASS—President Daniel Ortega of Nicaragua said on the radio-television programme "Face the People" that despite the need for taking a number of measures aimed at overcoming the serious economic difficulties, the policy of carrying out radical revolutionary reforms in the country remains invariable. The head of the Nicaraguan Government also said that in its economic development the country will adhere to the socialist orientation policy.

Touching upon the economic measures announced by the government the other day, the Nicaraguan leader noted the existence in the country of political forces hampering progressive reforms and intentionally creating economic problems to arouse indignation among the working people. These reactionary circles, Daniel Ortega noted, are doing their utmost to prevent the implementation by the Sandinist National Liberation Front of measures for improving the economy, thus undermining the country's economic fundamentals.

In connection with the continuing U.S. aggression in Nicaragua and the trade and economic blockade introduced by it, Daniel Ortega noted, the country is unable to ensure the supply of all the necessary things for the population because of the scantiness of the material resources. Therefore the economic measures taken by the government are aimed at invigorating various branches of the country's economy, regulating the pay of the workers and stabilising the country's economy as a whole.

Official on Situation in Northern Nicaragua
*LD2106091088 Moscow TASS in English 0830 GMT
21 Jun 88*

[Text] Managua June 21 TASS—Chieftains of the Indian nationalist organization Yatama and contras had worked out a joint plan of subversive operations spearheaded at frustrating the process of national reconciliation in Nicaragua's eastern areas where tribes of the Miskito Indians live. This was revealed by Julio Rugama, spokesman of the Nicaraguan Interior Ministry, in the city of Puerto Cabezas, the administrative center of the North Atlantic autonomous area.

Apart from stepping up subversive and terrorist actions in that autonomous area, the plan provides for killings of Indian chiefs who sided with people's power and back the process of national reconciliation. It is also planned to prevent by threats and sabotage the return home of thousands of Indian refugees who had been herded by force and deception to neighbouring Honduras. These actions are eventually aimed at preventing the granting of autonomy to areas on the Atlantic coast under an

appropriate law taken by the National Assembly and at thwarting elections to truly people's autonomous governments, which are scheduled to be held there at the end of this year.

A subversive propaganda campaign which was launched by contras radio stations placed in Honduras and Costa Rica, contributes to implementations of this subversive plan. Active psychological brain-washing of the population is also conducted by the Voice of America station with a repeater installed on the Honduran Island of Swan.

In this connection Jose Gonzalez, representative of the Sandinist National Liberation Front in the North Atlantic autonomous area, called on the local population to preserve vigilance and to oppose resolutely to intrigues of the enemies of revolution.

Lomeyko Briefs Mexican Government on Summit
*LD1506110188 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0035 GMT 15 Jun 88*

[Text] Mexico City, 16 Jun (TASS)—At the behest of Mexican President Miguel de la Madrid, Foreign Minister Bernardo Sepulveda received B.V. Lomeyko, the special representative of the Soviet leadership and special envoy, who briefed him on the results of the Moscow talks between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan.

On behalf of the Mexican Government the minister welcomed the results of the Moscow summit meeting, stressing its particular importance for the further development of Soviet-U.S. dialogue in the interests of ensuring international security.

Sepulveda expressed his support for the speedy achievement of new, real agreements in the field of nuclear and conventional arms and for the creation of nuclear-free zones in different areas of the world as an effective measure on the road to strengthening the system of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. He stressed Mexico's interest in consolidating international stability and resolving regional conflicts by way of talks and without interference from outside.

The minister expressed his gratitude to the Soviet leadership for the information passed on, describing it as a manifestation of the friendly nature of relations between Mexico and the USSR.

Political & Social

Further Reportage on Armenia, Azerbaijan Dispute

Tatliyev Addresses Azerbaijan Presidium
NC2106065888 Baku International Service
in Azeri 1200 GMT 18 Jun 88

[Excerpts] The 7th Session of the 11th Convocation of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet was held in Baku yesterday. The session discussed [words indistinct] and the tasks of the republic's soviets of people's deputies vis-a-vis the effort being made to upgrade the pace of social and cultural development in rural regions, as demanded by the path of reconstruction.

The session also discussed the appeal that was made by the deputies of the Nagorno-Karabakh Soviet of People's Deputies for the transfer of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast from the Azerbaijan SSR to the Armenian SSR. Suleyman Tatliyev, chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, addressed the session on the matter. Tatliyev said:

[Begin recording] Deputy comrades, the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium adopted a very important decision in connection with the appeal that was made by the deputies of the Nagorno-Karabakh Soviet of People's Deputies for the transfer of Nagorno-Karabakh from the Azerbaijan SSR to the Armenian SSR. From the point of view of the significant nature of the problem, not to mention the situation which has been created by it, the adoption of this decision was very essential.

Before we adopted the said decision, we made a very serious and responsible assessment of all the aspects of the problem during the meeting. We also regarded the recommendations and conclusions included in the Appeal Mikhail Gorbachev made to the workers and the peoples of the Azerbaijan and Armenian SSR's and the documents [words indistinct] as a guide to our deliberations.

The members of the Presidium considered the international interests of all the people in the republic and agreed that it was essential to consolidate the friendship and fraternal relations between the Azerbaijani and Armenian peoples, and to safeguard and protect Lenin's [words indistinct] and Azerbaijan's territorial integrity.

Deputy comrades, the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet session on 15 June adopted a decision which upheld the idea of including the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast within the framework of the Armenian SSR and which appealed to the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet in that regard.

Under the circumstances, the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium could do nothing else but submit the appeal to the Supreme Soviet. It must be said at this

point that resolving this matter is not within the jurisdiction of the Armenian SSR. Resolving this problem is completely within the inseparable jurisdiction of our republic and people.

Deputy comrades, in submitting this matter to the Supreme Soviet, the Supreme Soviet Presidium urges you to carefully debate the problem and adopt a relevant decision on it. [end recording] [passage omitted]

Kolkhoz Director (?Dzhuraman) Abbasova, poet Nabi Babayev, and others addressed the debate that was held on Nagorno-Karabakh. All of the speakers approved the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium's decision on 13 June 1988, which described the transfer of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast from the Azerbaijan SSR to the Armenian SSR as unacceptable.

The meeting adopted a unanimous decision of the matter to the effect that the transfer of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast from the Azerbaijan SSR to the Armenian SSR is impossible. The decision said that the transfer would conflict with the interests of the Azerbaijani, Armenian, and other peoples in Nagorno-Karabakh and the Azerbaijan SSR. It also said that it would not comply with the effort being made to strengthen friendship among the peoples of the Soviet Union and with the tasks of reconstruction.

Later, the deputies discussed the draft bill which called for a debate of the important problems of the state by the people. The meeting unanimously approved the bill [words indistinct].

'Unusual' Calm in Yerevan
LD2106012988 Yerevan International Service
in Armenian 1730 GMT 20 Jun 88

[Excerpts] An unusual calm and peace now prevails in the streets and squares of Yerevan. No more do dense crowds of people move toward the dramatic square. You might say everything is back to how it was months ago. People's hearts are filled with hope and anticipation: The resolution passed by the republic's Supreme Soviet session has reinforced their faith in the future. Now, casting a backward glance on the events of the past 4 months, you find it astonishing that this resolution was not adopted then. Instead we saw the creation of a yawning abyss and the collapse of relations between the people and our leadership, whose miscalculated silence and intolerable indifference provoked the people further, leading to (?a sharpening) of emotions and passions.

Throughout the events in question, when (?there was one and unified call), for the unification of Artsakh [ancient Armenian name for Nagorno-Karabakh], all these provocations fortunately failed to upset the balanced behavior of people who behaved in their customary civilized manner. Faith in restructuring, glasnost, and true democracy was also reinforced. I have been interviewing people of different ages and from various walks of life

and they have all said the same thing, without exception, about the resolution passed by the session of the republic's Supreme Soviet: It was, in their view, an important victory on the path of restructuring. [passage omitted]

(?I have already said that) the dramatic square in Yerevan is now calm. People are now coming here in small groups, (?to walk) across the beautiful square in the hope of hearing some [words indistinct] good news [words indistinct]. After all, life does not stand still. There are still many problems awaiting solution in our republic and it is we, ourselves, who have to solve these problems. This is the most important thing demanded of us today.

'Thousands' Gather in Stepanakert

AU2106093988 Paris AFP in English 0929 GMT
21 Jun 88

[Excerpt] Moscow, June 21 (AFP)—Thousands of people gathered outside the soviet, or parliament, of the mostly-Armenian enclave of Nagorno-Karabakh as it met Tuesday at Stepanakert to discuss the future status of the disputed region, an Armenian inhabitant of Stepanakert said. Contacted by telephone from Moscow, the Armenian added that a general strike begun over a month ago at Stepanakert, the chief town of Nagorno-Karabakh, was continuing.

He said that the parliamentarians attending the soviet's meeting had all called for Nagorno-Karabakh to be detached from Azerbaijan. He also confirmed that air traffic to and from Stepanakert had been suspended for the past few days, adding that roads leading to Armenia had been blocked. However, he said there were no major supply problems for the 35,000 inhabitants of Stepanakert.

Earlier, Armenian militant Igor Muradyan, contacted by telephone in the Armenian capital of Yerevan said the issue of Nagorno-Karabakh's future was the only item on the soviet's agenda. Representatives of Nagorno-Karabakh want to invoke Article 70 of the Soviet Constitution to demand that the enclave be integrated into Armenia, Mr Muradyan, a former leader of the banned Karabakh Committee, said. Article 70 concerns the "free self-determination" of the Soviet Union's republics. Mr Muradyan said the parliament groups around 140 members, of which less than 30 are Azeris. He did not know whether the Azeri parliamentarians attended Tuesday's meeting. [passage omitted]

Azerbaijan's Deputy Procurator Interviewed

NC2006081688 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
0900 GMT 17 Jun 88

["Exclusive" interview with Idris Askerov, Azerbaijan SSR deputy procurator and chief legal adviser, by correspondent Dzhandar Agayev in Baku; date not given—live or recorded]

[Text] [Agayev] The incidents that have taken place in and around Nagorno-Karabakh are still giving the people an uneasy feeling. The Armenian SSR Supreme

Soviet has adopted a decision calling for the transfer of Nagorno-Karabakh to the Armenian SSR. We have received many telegrams and calls from listeners, asking us to explain this matter.

[Askerov] The incidents in and around Nagorno-Karabakh have created a strained atmosphere in our republic during the past 4 months. Work has been halted in various establishments in Stepanakert and other rayons in Nagorno-Karabakh. Workers and employees are not reporting to work. How can this be explained? Our community is a working society. What is the meaning of avoiding work in such a society? No worker or employee should be reluctant to work because work is a means of survival. There are those who are encouraging the workers in Nagorno-Karabakh to organize illegal strikes and not work.

Consequently, a strong blow has been inflicted on international relations and on the international feelings of our people. Under the circumstances, each and every honest person must try to have the (?decision reversed), and our people must approach the problem with wisdom, maturity, and caution. The measures that are being effected must be aimed at improving the situation. The multinational meeting in Lenin Square on 13 June was the answer the workers gave to rebellious crimes. Under the circumstances, the debate held by the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet on Nagorno-Karabakh and the approval it gave for the transfer of Nagorno-Karabakh to the Armenian SSR are not aimed at alleviating the prevailing strained atmosphere, not can they be regarded as a contribution toward reconstruction.

First of all, let me say this: The decision that was adopted in Nagorno-Karabakh is not legal. The law which governs Nagorno-Karabakh stipulates what can be resolved by a convocation of the soviet of people's deputies. Matters related to the question of territory are not included within its jurisdiction. The question of moving out of an organization is a legal concept and has been considered in Article 72 of the USSR Constitution. On the basis of Article 72, each and every allied republic has the right to freely move out of the union.

However, the Constitution does not address the exclusion of an autonomous oblast or autonomous republic from the framework of an allied republic. On the contrary, according to Article 79 of the USSR Constitution, an allied republic determines its own territories, including those of its oblasts, rayons, and local areas, and resolves problems related to the administrative arrangement of its lands. In view of this, the question raised by the meeting of the Nagorno-Karabakh Soviet of People's Deputies in connection with the idea of moving out of the Azerbaijan SSR's jurisdiction conflicts with the Constitution.

Nevertheless, although it is illegal, a decision has been adopted. Therefore, action has to be taken against it.

The Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet has debated the appeal made by the Nagorno-Karabakh Soviet of People's Deputies and has adopted a decision calling for the approval of the transfer of Nagorno-Karabakh to the Armenian SSR. Let us make a logical assessment of this decision. You will agree with me that (everything asked for cannot be given away.) Is there anyone who will agree to the transfer of Nagorno-Karabakh, which is a large part of our homeland, to the Armenian SSR? I would like to draw your attention to the fact that in their multinational demonstration carried out 2 days before the decision was adopted in the Armenian SSR, our people replied to this question by saying that no part of the land can be given away. The Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium also passed a decree on the same day, rejecting the baseless land claims that were put forward by our neighbors. Therefore, the decisions that may be taken in the future in connection with the transfer of Nagorno-Karabakh will conflict with logic and the USSR Constitution. This is due to the fact that, according to Article 78 of the Constitution which has been published in the languages of all the peoples of the Soviet Union and is binding on all the Soviet peoples, the republic's lands cannot be changed without its consent. As is common knowledge, however, our republic has not allowed this. Therefore, this matter cannot even be discussed anymore.

I would like to recall the effort that was made to link the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet's decision to Article 70 of the USSR Constitution. But let us take a look at Article 70. It says the following: The Soviet Union is a multinational and united state that has been created by a number of nations which determined their future in freedom, and by the voluntary union of the allied Soviet Socialist Republics.

What is pointed out here is the union of the allied republics within the framework of a socialist federation. Therefore, from a legal point of view, using this article to wrest Nagorno-Karabakh away from the Azerbaijan SSR is [words indistinct] and baseless.

It is common knowledge that each and every law provides for a number of rights and duties. However, the decision adopted by the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet has not created any right or duty. In other words, it is nothing but a (futile endeavor). Therefore, it must be clearly explained that the decision made by the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet conflicts with the USSR Constitution.

[Agayev] The Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet's decision appealed to the USSR Supreme Soviet to resolve question of the transfer of Nagorno-Karabakh to the Armenian SSR.

[Askerov] This, too, is an indication that the move made by the architects of this decision conflicts with the Constitution. You must know that the USSR Supreme Soviet does not have the [word indistinct] to resolve this

problem. According to the Constitution, if two republics agree on effecting territorial changes, then the USSR Supreme Soviet approves their agreement. However, it should be kept in mind that the Azerbaijan SSR joined the Soviet Union voluntarily with its own territory, and without its consent nothing can change its territory, not even the allied state.

The Azerbaijan SSR will not allow this. People cannot agree to the fragmentation of their homeland.

[Agayev] Our listeners would like to know the reasons for these [word indistinct] arguments that have taken place during the past 70 years of our socialist state.

[Askerov] There are those who sow discord and provoke conflicts. I follow the press, including the Armenian SSR press, systematically. Let us look at one of the editions of *KOMMUNIST RESPUBLIKI*, which is published in the Russian language in the Armenian SSR. On 15 June, that is, on the day the meeting was held, the newspaper carried a long article by Professor (?Barturyan) entitled: Learning About History. Here is what the article said: The Armenian historians have missed an important national issue—the social, economic, and political history of Nagorno-Karabakh. The question of Nagorno-Karabakh's status was not properly settled in the twenties and injustice was done. As far as history is concerned, Nagorno-Karabakh, (?I repeat), all of Nagorno-Karabakh, is part of the Armenian SSR.

The scholar went on to state that Nagorno-Karabakh's wish to join the Armenian SSR was welcomed in that republic. However, it created a reaction in the Azerbaijan SSR, which resulted in the tragic incidents in Sumgait. He claimed that the incidents could not be linked only to hooligans, saying that their causes went deeper than that.

Has the scholar who, while sitting in Yerevan, talked about the historical roots of the incidents in Sumgait and described Azerbaijan's Nagorno-Karabakh region as part of the Armenian SSR, contributed toward international friendship or toward discord? The same question applies to the newspaper which printed his provocative article.

Let me also add that Professor (?Barturyan) has been elected as the head of the new center for the study of national (?problems) in the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences. However, it is difficult to believe that he will be able to make a sincere contribution toward national relations. There are many like him, but they are outnumbered by the people. As for history, facts cannot be changed. Wisdom and [word indistinct] will undoubtedly prevail. Misleading the people and changing historical facts are impossible.

Nagorno-Karabakh is an inseparable part of the Azerbaijan SSR and will remain as such. The Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet session, which will be held today, will confirm this.

The matter has been resolved once and for all. The objective behind whatever is being done is to create a state of uneasiness. The republic has many social and economic problems to resolve. Our people must focus all their attention on the effort made to resolve these problems and help the [words indistinct] and its leadership achieve our goal.

Voronin Meets Vezirov, Elected Delegate
PM1906110588 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY
in Russian 4 Jun 88 p 2

[AZERINFORM report: "Improving the Work of Material and Technical Supply Organs"]

[Text] L.A. Voronin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gosnab, was in Baku from 29 through 31 May.

During his stay, L.A. Voronin visited supply, cooperative, and industrial organizations, the Azerbaijan SSR Gosnab commercial center, and the "Bakkonditsioner" and "Azerelektroterm" Production Associations, where he had meetings and conversations with workers and with engineering and technical personnel. They discussed the progress of restructuring, work in the new conditions of economic activity, changes in the social sphere, and the activity of collectives' labor councils. Opinions were exchanged on questions of the preparations for the 19th all-union party conference.

L.A. Voronin took part in the work of the republic's Gosnab party economic aktiv. Dwelling on the tasks of the Gosnab collective in the light of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and subsequent party Central Committee plenums, he drew attention to the need for a radical change in the content, organization, and methods of supply organs' work, the need to galvanize the development of wholesale trade, to ensure a systemic approach to the resolution of problems of the rational use of raw materials, semimanufactures, and fuel, the need to improve the organization of balance sheet work, and perfect a system for efficient management of material resources. The persistent need to further reinforce delivery discipline and expand the commercial, production, and information and mediation services offered by Gosnab organs to the republic's consumers was pointed out.

A conversation took place at the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee between A.Kh. Vezirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, and L.A. Voronin.

Pressing problems to do with the restructuring of the economic mechanism, the acceleration of scientific-technical progress, and ways to boost the return derived from the republic's economic potential and improve forms and methods of economic work were discussed in detail. It was stressed that the further improvement of the activity of material and technical supply organs, the

implementation of a strict economy drive as regards resources, and the development of economically accountable relations in all elements of the economy are of tremendous importance for the successful realization of these tasks.

Comrade Voronin took part in the work of a plenum of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, at which he was elected as a delegate to the 19th all-union party conference.

During his stay in Baku, L.A. Voronin was accompanied by G.N. Seidov, chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers; F.E. Musayev, first secretary of the Baku party gorkom; A.N. Mutalibov, deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan Council of Ministers and chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Gosplan; Z.A. Samed-Zade, chief of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Economic Department; and R.A. Guseynov, chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Gosnab.

Afanasyev on Yeltsin Remarks, Nagorno-Karabakh
PM2006154288 Barcelona LA VANGUARDIA
in Spanish 3 Jun 88 p 9

[Rafael Poch report on PRAVDA editor Viktor Afanasyev statements to foreign reporters on 2 June in Moscow]

[Text] Moscow—"I have Yeltsin's complete statements to the BBC, and I am outraged," PRAVDA editor and CPSU Central Committee member Viktor Afanasyev said yesterday. With the usual message that there are no political crises, rivalries, or disputes within the Soviet leadership, Afanasyev painted a picture of normality and harmony affected only by the democratic debate within the CPSU Politburo and Central Committee. Within this context of normality, the only discordant note is sounded by Boris Yeltsin, who has attracted great interest in the West by enlivening the course of restructuring with attitudes and statements displaying a rashness unusual in the Soviet Union.

Viktor Afanasyev explained Mikhail Gorbachev's appreciation of Boris Yeltsin. "Last year at a ceremony at the Hall of Columns (the Moscow trade union building) we had an example of it. Gorbachev, Ligachev, Razumovskiy, Yeltsin, and I were there. After the ceremony, we were drinking tea. We talked at length about the press and Mikhail Sergeyevich (Gorbachev) said to me: 'Why do you not publish more items about what is happening in the provinces? You should expand your staff with people from outside Moscow. Look at the case of Boris Yeltsin: He, too, is from the provinces.' This is how cordial Mikhail Sergeyevich's attitude to Yeltsin was."

October Plenum [subhead]

According to Afanasyev, Yeltsin betrayed this atmosphere. "In the West, Yeltsin is regarded as the prime advocate of restructuring. This is not so. I can tell you why. Last August Yeltsin wrote Gorbachev a letter

requesting permission to resign his post as Moscow party secretary. Gorbachev called him and asked him not to create this problem until after the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. Nevertheless, Yeltsin aired his complaints on the very eve of the anniversary in the middle of the Central Committee session on 21 October. It was wrong: It was a breach of confidence and of his word." Why did it happen? "I do not know. The session was about to end when he started speaking, saying he did not know how, that he could not, that he was tired.... Then Gorbachev told him: 'Listen, Boris, perhaps you could change your statement, withdraw it, and we can still continue working together.' I saw all this; I was an eyewitness."

According to Afanasyev, Yeltsin's remarks to the BBC are a reflection of that same attitude. "For many years, he worked as obkom secretary in Sverdlovsk. In our system the obkom secretary is a major figure, the boss of his area. There he did whatever he wanted, and people liked him. Now Yeltsin is in Moscow. There there are a million inhabitants, and here there are 9.5 million. You cannot act in Moscow as he did in Sverdlovsk. You cannot act like the Red Army used to, whereby I give you an order and you obey it. He started making personnel changes, and not always good ones. He toured all Moscow's stores and markets, traveling by bus and streetcar.... He wanted to do everything himself—quickly, immediately. In Moscow, this is impossible. This is not Sverdlovsk. When he saw that his attempts at rapid change were impossible and slackened his efforts, he realized that he lacked the strength to combat what was going on in Moscow, that he could not work under such conditions. I could even state my personal opinion and say that he was psychologically disturbed. I am not saying by any means that he should have been confined to a mental institution, but he worked as though he were confused. To speak frankly, I can say that he abandoned ship at a critical moment. He himself left; nobody dismissed him.... Personally, I was enraged by his remarks."

Ligachev—a "Necessary Person" [subhead]

"I can understand his state of mind," Afanasyev said about Yeltsin's statements to the BBC. "He wanted to rush through spectacularly everything he tried to do, but he was unable to do so. However...the situation in which he found himself was his fault and his alone. He requested Ligachev's replacement—without evidence, without arguments, without anything. Everyone knew that relations between the two were not good, but that is a personal matter between Yeltsin and Ligachev. Why did he have to announce to all and sundry that Ligachev is an enemy of restructuring? There was no reason for it. I have known Ligachev very well for some time, and I must tell you that he is a very strong and very necessary person. He is a very conscientious party worker. In the West there is much talk about alliances and enmities between Gorbachev, Ligachev, Yakovlev, and so forth: It is pure speculation."

"I have witnessed, and continue to witness, all Politburo sessions directly, with my own eyes," Afanasyev continued. "There is no disagreement of any kind within our party leadership on whether or not restructuring is needed: Everyone wants it and realizes that there is no alternative."

"Specific Problems" [subhead]

"However, there are specific problems—problems regarding ways and means, differing viewpoints, contrasting opinions, and discussions—and it often happens that a discussion cannot be completed on a Thursday and a Friday has to be devoted to it, too.... It is a truly democratic situation.... Previously everything was very simple. People would come to the meeting, look at the necessary documents, vote, and everyone would leave within 30 minutes. Now we are returning to the climate of discussion. Why make statements and raise an outcry about it? I cannot understand it—or, rather, I do understand it, because people in the West seek something that does not exist in our country."

"Feelings and Reason" [subhead]

On 21 March, PRAVDA published an article entitled "Emotions and Reason" which the Armenian public regarded as a provocation. That night many people burned copies of PRAVDA in the streets of Yerevan. We asked Afanasyev about the article—the first official statement about the serious crisis in the Caucasus, which included no expression of condolences to relatives of the victims of the Sumgait pogrom (in which officially 32 people died) and which attacked the first peaceful mass movement in the Soviet Union's history. According to Afanasyev, the article "was well written, though we should have explained things more to avoid hurting the Armenians' national feelings. We did make a mistake here." Nevertheless, "the tone of the article was correct." On Nagorno-Karabakh, Viktor Afanasyev considers it "very possible" that the autonomous region will become an autonomous republic—a formula which, without separating it from Azerbaijan, would considerably increase its autonomy. "Our shortcoming is that we cannot distinguish between 'national' and 'nationalistic' feelings. We have always had the national in the habits, language, and customs of the population. However, when people talk about national supremacy, that is nationalistic. We must support everything national and reject everything nationalistic. There in Nagorno-Karabakh, everything became mixed up—the national with the nationalistic—and the local authorities could not tell the difference." There could be a repetition of the events in the autonomous region "because we have 100 peoples and nations. In Transcaucasus, it is a very delicate problem. It is a matter of relations between two republics—Azerbaijan and Armenia. Any stance on our part in favor of Azerbaijan would elicit a fierce response in Armenia."

Gromyko, Pimen Address Orthodox Church Guests

Gromyko Answers Questions

PM1706110388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
12 Jun 88 Second Edition pp 1,3

[TASS report: "Marking a Historic Date: A.A. Gromyko's Meeting With Participants in Jubilee Celebrations of the Russian Orthodox Church"]

[Excerpt] In the Kremlin on 11 June, A.A. Gromyko received a large group of participants in the jubilee celebrations dedicated to the 1000th anniversary of the introduction of Christianity into Russia. The participants included Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and All Russia, representatives of our country's clergy, and numerous foreign guests, including the heads of various churches and religious organizations from almost 100 foreign countries. K.M. Kharchev, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Council on Religious Affairs, took part in the meeting.

Addressing the guests, A.A. Gromyko said:

Esteemed Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and All Russia!

Esteemed participants in and guests of the jubilee celebrations dedicated to the 1000th anniversary of the Christianization of Russia!

Ladies and gentlemen!

Comrades and friends!

Latin, the language of the ancient Romans, had the word "oecumenicus." In translation this means "universal." The arrival in Moscow of the representatives of many religions in the past few days may be most accurately characterized by that very word.

Indeed, the emissaries of virtually all the faiths together with the Russian Orthodox Church are taking part in the celebrations marking a remarkable event in the history of world, European, and of course our fatherland's culture—the introduction of Christianity into Russia. It made a deep mark on the history of this vast country, a fact to which UNESCO justly drew attention in its appeal to commemorate this date extensively throughout the world.

Many centuries separate us from that legendary past and conceal many of the events of those years. Scholarly publications describe how, long before the adoption of Christianity as the state religion of Kievan Rus, some of its distinguished people had already accepted Greek Orthodoxy and were using Cyrillic, the alphabet devised by Cyril and Methodius for the Slavs. It serves as our Russian alphabet to this day.

These days, however, we are marking the jubilee of that occasion which was an important landmark in the history of the Russian state. The adoption of Christianity played a great role in its formation and development on the land of our distant forefathers. It brought Ancient Rus into the orbit of the broad international life of medieval Europe.

Orthodoxy, the Eastern branch of Christianity, became the state religion and exerted a great influence on its politics, economics, education, upbringing, the family, and everyday life. No one can deny the significance of the Russian Orthodox Church's role in the annals of our state.

The Church took part in consolidating the forces of the people during crucial periods in their history and helped to unite separate lands into a single state which became the largest state in Europe. And during the period of the Mongol-Tatar yoke it helped to preserve national unity.

The influence of the Christian religion on the culture of the Russian peoples is now considered beyond dispute: It gave a new impetus to the assimilation of the spiritual values of West and East.

The adoption of Christianity enabled Russ to also receive in part the culture of Byzantium. Its stone architecture, frescoes, and mosaics appeared here. Many works of literature, both religious and secular, were translated.

Chroniclers left their descendants the great monuments of their time—the Russian Chronicles. That was the era of the careful nurturing of the young seedling which later became the majestic tree of the nation's culture. Even then the Russian, who loved his fatherland ardently and was ready to lay down his life in its defense, understood clearly that you have to respect foreigners so long as they are motivated by benevolence.

We live in a different era now. It began in October 1917 when the Great Socialist Revolution was accomplished in Russia.

The valuable seeds of internationalist consciousness planted in the distant past put forth fine shoots in the post-October period. This consciousness has become the historic need of all the peoples of the Soviet Land and promotes the mutual enrichment of the cultures of our multinational socialist fatherland.

This real process in which the peoples come to know one another produces that philanthropic moral atmosphere characteristic of Soviet society.

A product of our society's lofty culture is the party's idea, expressed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, on the new political thinking in the nuclear age, which is designed to end all alienation between the conduct of state affairs and general human norms of morality.

The political aspirations of the Soviet Union and its people are concentrated in the single brief word "mir." We want a world without nuclear or space weapons. We want a world without weapons of mass destruction. We want a world with no weapons at all. This means that it must be the kind of world in which there are no wars and where there must be no violence. We want a world for all people.

In our day man's sacred right to life has acquired a truly global content. Man has achieved lofty humanistic ideals through suffering throughout his history. The things which once only advanced minds propounded have now become the vital cause of the peoples, and this is having an increasing influence on international relations.

These are the ideals of peace, freedom, and the value of each human life. It is these ideals which form the basis of all our country's initiatives in the international arena.

Take the specific platform of the system of universal international security developed by the 27th CPSU Congress. It includes an understanding of the complexity of the interests of different states, an acknowledgment of their contradictory nature, and at the same time a proclamation of the integrated and interdependent nature of the modern world and, finally, a forewarning of the danger of nuclear death which is the same for all.

Does all this not demand the establishment of good relations and collaboration among countries? Does this not force people to think about contact and about a knowledge of peoples near and far? Finally, does all this not dictate the need to protect the temple of general human cooperation irrespective of the ideological, religious, and other differences between people?

I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to meet with the heads or most important representatives of many churches of the world and with the leaders of international, regional, and various national religious organizations so as to express to you all our respect for your work in the sphere of protecting the peaceful life.

Your actions in this direction are a life-giving stream which, like other movements of fighters for peace, helps to unite people moving toward a single goal—the preservation of human life.

The Soviet leadership welcomes the participation of the multinational Russian Church and other religious organizations of our country in vigorous actions which meet the lofty criteria of Soviet patriotism.

The sense of being a patriot of our land was forged during the Great Patriotic War years when the entire Soviet people, including believers, struggled against the fascist invaders for the survival of mankind. Yes, for all mankind! Of course, our people will never forget the contribution which our World War II allies made to the rout of fascism.

We welcome the participation of the Russian Orthodox Church and all other churches in our country in the humanitarian measures which are being implemented on a broad scale in the Soviet Union. This applies in particular to the donations to various voluntary funds aimed at preserving peace, protecting children, developing culture, and restoring ancient monuments.

Other states' religious circles make a valuable contribution to freeing mutual relations among the peoples from the type of thoughts and actions which are inappropriate to the conditions of the nuclear and space age.

The curbing of militarism and the elimination of weapons of mass destruction—that is the main path whereby many global problems can be resolved.

The danger of environmental catastrophe forces all of us to think of new ways of ensuring security.

The eruption of contradictions in various parts of the world which leads to armed clashes demands time and again that people seek to embody the principles of the new thinking in the sphere of real political practice.

The first improvements on this path may be noted with satisfaction. A fine example of that is the recent Soviet-U.S. summit. The agreement on the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, which has gone into force and is beginning to take effect, fills our hearts with hope and strengthens faith in mankind's peaceful future.

The Moscow summit was a major step on the path toward a safe world but, nonetheless, it is only the beginning of that path.

What legacy will we bequeath to the future generation?

How will we greet the new century, the 21st century, and the new millennium, the third millennium?

Will we be able to eliminate the nuclear arsenals before the end of the century, as the Soviet Union proposes?

I think that I would be right in saying that we are united in our aspiration for peace and happiness on earth. I would like to end my speech with those words. (prolonged applause)

A.A. Gromyko then answered questions from participants in the meeting.

Question: At the meeting in the Kremlin with the Patriarch and members of the Russian Orthodox Synod M.S. Gorbachev said that work is now in progress on preparing a draft law on freedom of conscience which will also reflect the interests of religious organizations.

What can you tell us about that?

Answer: Yes, such a draft is in preparation. It is difficult at the moment to say how much time it will take but everything possible will be done to ensure that there is no unwarranted delay in the preparation of the draft law.

Question: The followers of Orthodoxy, Catholicism, Islam, and other religions sometimes live a long way from other religious associations. Nevertheless, their requests for the organization of new religious societies, temples, churches, prayer houses, and mosques, as we know from the press, are in some cases turned down. May one hope that in the conditions of democracy and restructuring these questions will be resolved more easily?

Answer: Yes, they will be resolved more easily. It goes without saying that when questions of this type are being tackled, Soviet law must be strictly observed. (applause)

Question: Will the church be accorded the right of a legal entity?

Answer: That question is being studied. I believe that the results of that study will be reflected in the corresponding legislation.

Question: How is the question of children's religious education being handled?

Answer: Lenin's decree on the separation of church and state and of education and the church applies in our country. That should be the basis.

Question: Is the requirement that religious organizations register with state organs not an infringement of their rights?

Answer: Of course not. I would go further. I believe that religious organizations should be interested in such registration.

Question: Can religious organizations engage in philanthropic activity?

Answer: Yes, they can. The question must be resolved on each occasion in the light of Soviet law.

Question: A few years ago, in connection with the beginning of the preparation for celebrating the Russian Orthodox Church jubilee—the 1000th anniversary of Christianity in Russia—His Holiness Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and All Russia and the Russian Orthodox Synod asked the government to transfer to the Moscow Patriarchate the near and far catacombs of the Pecherskaya Lavra [11th century monastery] near Kiev. Can you tell us, please, how this question is being resolved at present?

Answer: This question has been resolved positively. Kiev recently witnessed the ceremony of transferral of part of the Kiev Pecherskaya Lavra Museum to the Russian Orthodox Church. (applause)

Question: Of the historical and architectural monuments under the state's protection a considerable proportion are religious buildings. Could the church not take a greater part in the restoration and protection of such monuments?

Answer: It could, but on each occasion that participation must be coordinated with the local authorities.

Question: If two people, one a believer, the other an atheist, apply for a job, which one will be preferred?

Answer: No one, including the administration, will be interested in this question of faith. (applause)

A.A. Gromyko had received the aforementioned questions in advance in writing and gave answers to them. After that he began to answer questions from the hall.

A question from Lutheran Bishop Werner Leich, chairman of the Conference of Evangelical Church Directorates of the GDR Federation of Evangelical Churches. I understand the principle of the separation of religion from the state. However, is it possible for the church to give children religious instruction within its own walls, and does that opportunity extend to Lutheran religious associations?

Answer: This is a question of principle, not of religious buildings.

Patriarch Feoktist of the Romanian Orthodox Church made a statement in which he expressed approval of the Soviet-U.S. summit and thanked the Soviet leadership for the protection of the sacred gift of life and the provision of conditions conducive to the holding of the jubilee celebrations on the 1000th anniversary of Christianity in Russia.

A.A. Gromyko: I think that this statement should be viewed positively.

Shaykh 'Abd-al-Saykh (Jordan), chairman of the Committee for the Salvation of Jerusalem, and Metropolitan P'eksey of Leningrad and Novgorod, in their speeches and questions, reflected the concern of those religious figures from the Near East and from the Russian Orthodox Church who believe that regional conflicts complicate the international situation. The solution of the Afghan problem was received with a sense of particular satisfaction. Representatives of the clergy wanted to know what response there had been in the world to the solution of that problem. In addition, are there prospects of the solution of the Near East problem in view since the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and President Reagan?

Answer: In essence you have broached two questions. Both are important and topical. First, the question on Afghanistan. The solution of the Afghan problem has had a tremendous response in the world, but what have we seen recently? We have seen certain states attempting flagrant violations of the Geneva agreements, as I am sure you know. We would like to hope that these violations will cease and that the agreements will be scrupulously observed.

Now for the Near East. We support the solution of the Near East problem. It cannot be considered resolved at present. This is so first because Israel has not freed the Arab territories which it has occupied and, second, because the Palestinian Arab people's legitimate rights have not been satisfied.

We have our own viewpoint and our proposals on this score. We are convinced that they meet the long-term interests of all states, first and foremost those in the Near East.

Our initiatives relate to the convening of an international conference on questions of a Near East settlement involving all interested sides—and I emphasize—all interested sides including the Palestinian people's legitimate representative, the PLO, and the five permanent members of the UN Security Council. We are convinced that this proposal is justified. We would like to think that eventually it will be implemented. The Arabs broadly support it. Israel does not support it, neither does the United States at the moment. I would also like to think that common sense and long-term fundamental interests will prevail. And that as a result a way will be found to convene an international conference and thereafter to settle the Near East situation.

A question from Herbert Childstrem (United States), bishop of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. [name and title as published] Could you say something about the possibility of the import into the USSR of religious literature in the future?

Answer: If such literature serves the cause of rapprochement between the peoples and the cause of peace and the prevention of nuclear catastrophe we have no objections to it.

A question from Jean Fischer (Switzerland), secretary general of the Conference of European Churches. The European churches are interested in the creation of a general European home. We note with gladness and appreciation those improvements which have been seen in the disarmament sphere. I have in mind here the recent Soviet-U.S. treaty which has been ratified and has gone into force. But we are also thinking about the development of general human contacts. How do you view the changes in this direction?

Answer: You rightly emphasized the significance of the need to create and strengthen the common European home. That is what we think, too. Our idea coincides with yours. It seems to us that when considering Europe's purpose the states must make great efforts and act to ensure that the danger of clashes and especially the danger of war does not emanate from Europe.

The Helsinki statement and its honest fulfillment play a great role here, of course. We want human contacts to develop in all spheres: official, unofficial, and social. There are many organizations of all kinds in existence now, including in the Soviet Union. We came to the conclusion long ago that contact between those organizations, even contact between individuals not belonging to any organizations, and well-intentioned contact is an extremely important way to improve relations between states.

I would like to emphasize in this connection that official contacts and parliamentary contacts play a special role. They are of extremely great significance. Not a day passes now without some foreign delegation visiting our country and sometimes a number of delegations at the same time. Nor is there a day when at least one and sometimes more than one Soviet delegation is somewhere abroad. Trips by individual citizens are increasing. This is a positive phenomenon. Several years ago it did not exist.

So the thought which you just expressed is correct. It is absolutely accurate, and we believe that human contacts are an important means of improving relations between states and strengthening peace between the peoples.

A question from Shaykh Ahmed Kaftaru, Grand Mufti of Syria. I wholeheartedly and fervently hail Mr Gorbachev's efforts to ensure freedom of religion. I also thank you for the opportunity which you have afforded us to meet as sons of our common home, earth, and to talk about those things which interest the family of all people. My question is this. Can there be a dialogue between faith and science, faith and reason for the sake of the building and interests of peace throughout the world? I would like the forces of science and religion to unite in a single rank and present a united formation against the threat of universal destruction through nuclear weapons. If your answer is in the affirmative, could preparations for such a dialogue begin so as to achieve the common goal of peace throughout the world?

Answer: This is an important and legitimate question. Of course it is quite possible for there to be dialogue between science and the church and between reason and the church and also between the government and the church. (Applause)

After all, is our meeting not evidence of such a dialogue? And are not the meetings between the representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church and M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and

the meetings which you had yesterday not a dialogue on questions of politics and religion? Therefore I can give a positive answer on the matter of dialogue between church and governments and between church and science. If the intentions are good the result can only be positive.

Of course, the ideas of brotherhood which you have raised in this connection, in your own expression, we call the ideas of peace and friendship between the peoples. They can only unite society and the state in the struggle for peace and to avert the nuclear threat. I regard your statement as unconditionally positive.

A question from Ignatius IV, patriarch of Antioch and All the East (Syria). You said in your speech that the Russian Church helped to mold Russian culture. We believe that the church also helps to create man's individuality. In your opinion, what means should the Russian Church use to maintain the individual's high spirituality?

Answer: I think that the church must determine its own concrete role in these matters. But since you are asking me this question you obviously expect me to answer. It will be official. Everything the church does to strengthen friendship between the peoples or, as those present here sometimes say, brotherhood between them is not only acceptable but also highly beneficial. That is so regardless of whether it is being done in Europe, the Near East, Asia, or, say, Latin America. These are steps which one expects from the church. Its role in creating lofty spirituality is great.

Question from Cardinal Johannes Willebrands (Vatican), president of the secretariat for promoting Christian unity. You began your speech with the word "oecumenicus," which corresponds to my function in the Roman Catholic Church. We advocate the unity of Christians and have close contacts with the Russian Orthodox Church. And we are grateful for the process of restructuring which has enabled us to make further progress in that direction. There are many Catholics in your country, mostly living in the Baltic republics. But there some living in other parts of the Soviet Union, too. In this connection I would like to ask whether it is not possible to organize our Catholic Church in your country not only in the Baltic republics but wherever Catholics live?

Answer: Of course, there is no attempt to infringe the rights of the Catholic Church in our country. Just as there is no attempt to infringe the rights of Catholics living in the Soviet Union. You mentioned some specific republics where they live. The questions which they raise are the subject of the local authorities' attention. These questions are examined and the appropriate decisions taken. These decisions are not directed against legitimate wishes.

Such questions will continue to be examined attentively in the future. In other words, we will continue showing due attention to the wishes of Soviet Catholics wherever they may live.

Question from Archbishop Khrisostomos (Cyprus). Will disarmament lead to peace if justice is violated? I ask this because the Cypriot people cannot live in conditions of peace when there are Turkish troops on one-half of their native territory and when they live far from their homes and the graves of their forefathers. Perhaps the great powers could study the question of how to establish justice in places where it is being breached?

Answer: You have linked the questions of religion and politics. They affect Cyprus and the Cypriot people, of course, but you are not the first to have linked these questions.

We, and indeed everyone, know that the situation on Cyprus is abnormal. The country is divided in two. The necessary cooperation between the two communities and the two peoples who have lived on Cyprus since time immemorial is missing. There is no easy solution to the Cyprus problem.

It is our deep conviction that if certain states were interested in the proper solution of the Cyprus question it could be resolved. However, their military-strategic considerations play a role here. Thus the answer to your question is that different states are pursuing different policies.

As for the Soviet Union, it will continue to pursue toward Cyprus the policy which it has long pursued. Our country began defending the Cypriot people's legitimate rights many years ago and will continue to do so. If the church shares that line it can also contribute to the solution of the Cyprus question. But it is not our place to judge what that contribution should be nor what specific means should be used. But the church can have its say.

Question from Bkhaikshu Amritanandu, president of the Nepalese Buddhist organization. I am a Buddhist monk from Nepal. You know that there are very few Buddhists in your country. We maintain contacts with them. Will this small Buddhist community in the Buryat ASSR and Chita Oblast be allowed to build new temples or rebuild old ones, if they wish?

Answer: We pursue a fair policy in our country. We intend to conduct all our relations with the church and with all religious communities in the country in a positive vein. That must be the basis.

We can only respond positively to requests from other countries so long as those wishes are well-intentioned.

Question from Bishop Karoly Toth of the Hungarian Reformed Church, president of the Christian peace conference. The UN General Assembly's third special

session on disarmament is being held in New York now. You yourself may be regarded as one of the founders of that international organization. Some disarmament treaties have already been signed and some are being examined. In your opinion, what is the United Nations' role in promoting the conclusion of these agreements, and what role could it play in helping the conclusion of such treaties in the future?

Answer: The general political atmosphere surrounding this tremendously important question is clear. The polarization of forces in the world today is such that the peoples and—we are justified in saying—the majority of the countries of the world support disarmament. We have already mentioned our country, and its stance is clear. We want the elimination of all types of weapons of mass destruction. This applies primarily to nuclear weapons.

But there are forces which do not share our position or who at any rate do not share it fully or are even opposed to it. In the sphere of practical politics they operate in such a way that the steps taken toward disarmament and the reduction of nuclear armaments and other types of weapons of mass destruction are not sufficiently resolute.

The UN role is to do everything to promote the disarmament process, including the preparation of agreements and treaties on disarmament.

Henri Lopez, UNESCO deputy director general, noted the fact that A.A. Gromyko's opening address had cited his organization. The UNESCO guest said that he was pleased to be taking part in the celebrations and saw them as symbol of the changes taking place in the Soviet Union. He wholeheartedly welcomed the changes taking place in the USSR and expressed his good wishes to the Soviet leadership.

A.A. Gromyko stated that he was interested to hear this statement and viewed it positively. The statement implies that UNESCO is seeking to make a positive contribution by its appropriate means to people's struggle for peace and friendship. The very fact that UNESCO has decided to mark the 1000th anniversary that we are discussing today demonstrates that this organization takes a sober and knowledgeable approach to those questions which it has to examine and which are within its competence. I would merely like to wish that UNESCO continue to take that approach to the questions under its scrutiny and which it presents to states for their examination. We wish this international organization nothing but success in its work.

Question from Pastor Richard Andriamanjato (Madagascar). I have two questions connected with the international nature of the event in which we are taking part. They concern the 1000th anniversary of Christianity in Russia and restructuring in the Soviet Union. Too many lies have been told on this score in the developing

countries. My first question is: Will the USSR Government issue a directive to its embassies on what they have said about the changes taking place in relation to the church so that the peoples in those countries rid themselves of the false ideas about the state of religion in the Soviet Union?

The second question is this. Will the Russian Orthodox Church receive any privileges from the Soviet Government to enable it to help the developing countries, particularly in Africa?

Answer: Some participants in this meeting have mentioned restructuring, albeit only in passing. You have put this question more clearly.

I should like to speak briefly about it, although it is not easy to be brief on this theme. It is a vast and exceptionally important theme. We have set ourselves a colossal task and have complete faith that we will resolve it. You have probably noticed that we do not set a specific date by which we are to resolve this task. But we shall do so, and the sooner the better. We have the strength for it. Our potential is enormous. We have by no means exhausted it.

We want to improve our people's life in a socialist society. We will do that. I would like to ask our foreign guests to take with them the impression of our confidence and of the fact that our leading Communist Party and our society are fully determined to accomplish everything to do with restructuring in the economic and social sphere and in people's actual thinking. These are difficult tasks, very difficult ones even, but they can be resolved. We proceed from that assumption.

You say that it would be good if we issued the appropriate directives to our ambassadors abroad. But our embassies are the embassies of the Soviet Union. They are well informed about our policy, including in the restructuring sphere. And they are fully competent to provide the appropriate explanations. That also applies to the African countries.

You also asked whether it is possible to give church assistance to the developing countries. It is for the church to decide what specific forms that assistance should take. As for the Soviet Union as a state, we give as much assistance to the developing countries as we can.

You probably come across publications which report that on the basis of reciprocity the sides in question agreed such and such. But reciprocity must sometimes be understood in a political sense. The Soviet Union gives a state much assistance and then its representatives come to us and say: "We cannot repay you." What do we do in such circumstances? Do we quarrel? That is not part of our intentions. Do you understand what conclusions stem from this?

However, we are not changing our principled line. We have helped the developing countries, we are helping them, and we will continue to do so.

We, too, are dissatisfied by a situation in which many developing countries are shackled by debts. They bear a colossal debt burden. This question still demands solution. Nevertheless, we favor helping the developing countries.

"Gembakusha" [atom bomb victim] Machio Kurakawa from Japan, representing the victims of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima. I should like to ask you, Mr Chairman, to accept a modest gift from Japan's "gembakushas." It is a modest little porcelain bracelet made in an oven heated by the fire in which Hiroshima was seared by the nuclear bomb.

From the bottom of my heart I want to thank the Russian Orthodox Church for inviting me to visit your country as a representative of the "gembakusha" and for enabling me to meet and talk with Soviet people.

For us Japanese, the Soviet Union is a near and at the same time far country. Many Japanese do not know the true situation in the Soviet Union. When I return to my country I will have to tell them what is really happening in your country and how Soviet people sincerely desire peace.

I wholeheartedly support the noble efforts which the Soviet Government has been making, particularly recently, to ensure that the abomination of nuclear weapons disappears from the earth forever. And I wholeheartedly support those efforts because I am sure that nuclear weapons and man cannot coexist.

I am making a sincere request to you: Let us unite our efforts so that man can always live peacefully on earth. (applause)

A.A. Gromyko thanked her for her gift and her fine and heartfelt statement.

Question from Cardinal Agostino Casaroli, Vatican secretary of state. During the preparation of the law on freedom of conscience do the Soviet state organs intend to discuss that law with the representatives of the different faiths so as to obtain their opinion and criticisms and take account of their objections?

Answer: Of course, if a question is relevant to church representatives it is logical to find out the church's opinion not only when that law is ready but also during the preparation process. Contacts of that kind can only be beneficial.

Cardinal Casaroli: With your permission I would now like to make the statement which I have prepared.

I would like to state to all those gathered here and to you personally that for us it is not only an honor but also a matter of enormous satisfaction to be speaking here in these special circumstances. I say this on behalf of the delegation which Pope John Paul II has sent here. We represent both the Holy See and the Catholic Church at the celebrations dedicated to the 1000th anniversary of Christianity in Russia. This gives us joy. It corresponds to that sincere joy which we observed in Moscow and Zagorsk, where celebrations are being held. I am sure that these events will be joyous in Leningrad, Kiev, and Vladimir, where celebrations will also be held. This gives me satisfaction because the celebrations are being held, as far as I am aware, with the participation of all categories of Soviet society. I have in mind the Moscow patriarchate, other churches and religious communities, social organizations, and—particularly important—the state authorities.

In the very recent past these events could have caused a certain embarrassment and division. Now, however, this event is a uniting factor, which in some foreigners' eyes would have been inconceivable before. All of this helps this already historic event—the 1000th anniversary of Christianity in Russia—to acquire an even more specific character.

The pope was aware of that and for that reason sent to Moscow what may be called a bilateral delegation, representing the Holy See and the Catholic Church. This delegation is unprecedented in its character, number, and the high office of its representatives.

I am sure that there have never been so many cardinals on Russian soil or in your capital, which bears with honor and glory the title "the Third Rome." Many of these cardinals belong to the Curia, others come from well-known Catholic sees. They include bishops representing virtually the whole of Africa and Latin America.

Permit me to say that this is a token of special respect and love for the Russian Orthodox Church. It is also respect and love for the peoples of the Soviet Union, for a great church, and a great state. Our wishes for your success are just as great. (applause)

A.A. Gromyko: I thank Cardinal Casaroli for his interesting and significant statement. We can only welcome all joint efforts in the same direction, be they coordinated or separate. This applies to efforts by the Catholic Church, the Orthodox Church, and other churches aimed at friendship, fraternity, and the preservation of peace among the peoples. That was the main idea stemming from the cardinal's statement. [passage omitted]

Pimen Addresses Group
LD1106181188 Moscow Television Service
in Russian 1357 GMT 11 Jun 88

[Text] [Announcer] Today Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko received a large group of those taking part in jubilee celebrations marking the 1000th anniversary of

the introduction of Christianity in Russia. Among them are Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and All Russia, representatives of our country's clergy, and foreign guests, including leaders of various churches and religious organizations from over 100 countries. Speaking to those taking part in the meeting, Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko said:

[Begin recording] [Gromyko] Esteemed Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and All Russia, esteemed participants and guests of the jubilee celebrations marking the 1000th anniversary of the introduction of Christianity in Russia, ladies and gentlemen, comrades and friends! We have been celebrating the jubilee of the date denoting an important landmark in the history of Russian statehood. The adoption of Christianity played a great role in the establishment and development of the land of our distant ancestors. It brought ancient Russia into the orbit of medieval Europe's broad international life. The Eastern section of Christianity, Orthodoxy, became a state religion and exerted a great influence on politics, the economy, upbringing, education, family, and daily life. No one may deny the significance and the role of the Russian Orthodox Church in the chronicle of our great power. The Church took part in consolidating the people during critical historical periods, and furthered the unification of fragmented lands into a single state, which became a major European state. During the Mongol Tatar yoke it helped to preserve national unity.

The influence of Christian religion on Russian culture has already been irrefutably proven. The process of mastering spiritual values from the West and the East received a new impulse. The chroniclers left as their posterity great literary texts of their time—the Russian chronicles. This was the era when the young sapling, which has grown into a majestic tree of the fatherland's culture, was being carefully looked after. Valuable seeds of internationalist consciousness sown in very ancient times have produced beautiful shoots during the post-October period. This consciousness has become a historic requirement of all Soviet peoples. It promotes mutual enrichment among the cultures of our multinational socialist fatherland. A brainchild of our society's high culture is the idea of the party, expressed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, about new political thinking in the nuclear age, which is required to end the estrangement between the way international matters are tackled and the ethical norms common to all men.

The aspirations of the Soviet Union and its people can be summed up in one brief word: Peace. The Soviet leadership welcomes the multinational Russian church and our other religious organizations in active deeds meeting the high criteria of Soviet patriotism. Contradictions exploding individual regions of the world, which lead to armed clashes, demand persistent striving to implement the principles of the new thinking in real political practice. One can note with satisfaction the first positive changes on this path.

The Soviet-U.S. summit meeting which took place just recently is an excellent example of this. The agreement on eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles that has come into force and is beginning to take effect instills hope in our hearts and strengthens our belief in the peaceful future of mankind.

What will we bequeath to the next generation? How will we greet the new, 21st century and the new, 3d millennium? Will we be able by the end of the present century to eliminate nuclear arsenals, as the Soviet Union proposes? I think I will not be mistaken if I say that we are united in our aspiration to peace and happiness on earth. [applause] [end recording]

[Announcer] Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko then answered numerous verbal and written questions.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified speaker] At the meeting in the Kremlin with the patriarch and members of the Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said that work is currently in progress on drawing up a draft law on freedom of conscience, which will reflect the interests of religious organizations. What can you say about this?

[Gromyko] Yes, a law is being drawn up. I hope that preparing it will not take too much time.

[Voice of announcer over video of Roman Catholic cardinal asking question] Cardinal Agostino Casaroli, Vatican secretary of state. While the law is being drawn up, do you intend to discuss it with representatives of various faiths to elucidate their opinions and find out about any criticism?

[Gromyko] Where an issue relates to (or affects) the church, it is of course logical to find out the church's opinion, not only after the law has been drawn up and adopted, but also during the drawing up process. So contacts can only be useful.

[Metropolitan Aleksey of Leningrad and Novgorod] Most esteemed Andrey Andreyevich, could you possibly answer a question which, I think, disturbs many people here because many religious figures have come from the Near East. We know how much regional conflicts complicate the international situation, and with what special feeling of satisfaction the solution of the Afghanistan problem was received, and the reaction the solution of this problem evoked in the world. Following the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev with U.S. President Reagan, do you see any prospects for solution of the Near East question?

[Gromyko] We are in favor of solving the Near East question. It is now far from solved. It has not been solved, first of all, because Israel has not liberated the occupied Arab territories. Second, because the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arab people have not been satisfied. We have our own point of view and our own

proposals on this. We are convinced that these correspond to at least the long-term interests of all states, first and foremost, of course, the Near East states. Our proposals concern the convening of an international conference on Near East issues, with all the parties in the conflict taking part—I stress, all parties in the conflict—including the super powers. We are convinced that this proposal is well-founded and objective. We would like to believe that it will, in the final analysis, be adopted.

[Voice of announcer over video and background audio of unidentified speaker] Answering a question about the role of the church in the struggle for disarmament, Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko stressed:

[Gromyko] It is our profound conviction that the church, regardless of its orientation and creed, cannot but stand for disarmament. And if the church values above all human life, peace, and brotherhood between peoples, then it can back only those forces, political forces, and all those countries and peoples who stand for a solution, a radical solution, of this problem. [end recording]

[Announcer] Comrade Gromyko answered other questions concerning relations between state and church.

Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and All Russia spoke on behalf of those present.

[Begin Pimen recording] Profoundly esteemed Andrey Andreyevich, accept our cordial gratitude for the attention you have shown us, we who are taking part in celebrating the millennium of the baptism of Russia. One feels an involuntary excitement, treading on the sacred ground of the Moscow Kremlin. The Kremlin is for believers of the Russian Orthodox Church, as for all our people, a sacred place, a symbol of the might and unshakeability of our country. Its churches are age old witnesses of the courage and spiritual fortitude of our people, and of its profound patriotism. The Russian Orthodox Church, which has always shared the destiny of its people, here displayed great examples of its selfless service to the fatherland, which is its vocation according to God-given traditions. It is from here that noble Prince Dimitry Donskoy went out to meet the foes of the fatherland, spiritually nourished by Metropolitan Aleksey and blessed Saint Sergius of the Holy Church, which has today been glorified anew. Here, under the protection of the church, the unity of great Russia was created. Here in the Kremlin, one feels special joy for our great fatherland, for our people. During these days of our lofty celebrations one involuntarily repeats the words of Metropolitan Ilarion of Kiev, which he pronounced 7 decades after the baptism of Russia to the effect that we live not in a weak and unknown land, but in the Russian land, which is known of and heard about in all four corners of the Earth.

We have dedicated the current week to fulfilling a wide program of jubilee celebrations. Our guests, whom you see here, have gathered together in Moscow, truly from

all four corners of the Earth, to share the joy of celebrating the 1000 years of existence of the Russian Orthodox Church, as they have just so benevolently been described.

Two days ago, in the Trinity-St. Sergius Monastery of the Caves, the local council of our Church ended its work, dedicated to the jubilee. The assembled higher clergy, representatives of the clergy, and laypeople paid tribute to the Russian Orthodox Church, to the spiritual enlightenment of the people, and to its rich contribution, so diverse over the course of its history, to the life of society and the state. The council examined the main aspects of modern Church life, and adopted decisions on many vital issues. The council determined the further orientation of our Church's witness and service. The council expressed profound gratitude to the leadership of our country (?for) its amicable attention to the Church's needs, which have today been embodied in life. We have many examples that are reflected by soul-stirring responses in the hearts of our believers. We were especially appreciative of the most favorable conditions created by our state for holding our celebrations, which enabled every member of the Russian Orthodox Church to participate in the jubilee, and enabled our society to commemorate many outstanding aspects of the life of the fatherland connected with the millennium of Christianity in our country.

We are still impressed by the meeting with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, which was a clear testimony to the reestablishment of Leninist norms of relations between Church and state in our country. We see this, too, in your reception of representatives of churches and guests at the jubilee celebrations. All this inspires us to deepen our participation in the beneficial process of restructuring our society. The Russian Orthodox Church will do everything possible to help strengthen the moral foundations of life for believers and to instilling in them lofty civic principles.

Our Church will exert all possible efforts through its peace-making service, to bring closer the fulfilment of world's aspiration—ridding the earth of nuclear weapons by the beginning of the 3d millennium since the birth of Christ. In connection with this great task, we will do everything possible to assist the further development of Soviet-U.S. cooperation in nuclear disarmament which received a new and strong impulse at the recent summit meeting in Moscow. [applause] [end recording]

Metropolitan Filaret on Church-State Relations
AU2006153788 Hamburg DER SPIEGEL in German
20 Jun 88 pp 148-155

[Interview with Metropolitan Filaret, Russian Orthodox archbishop of the dioceses of Minsk and Belorussia, by DER SPIEGEL journalists Heinz Hoefl and Joerg R. Mettke in Moscow's Danilov Monastery: "Freedom Is Worse Than Persecution"; date not given]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] SPIEGEL: Will the party approve more priests and monks for you?

Filaret: At a meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev, we broached the question of more church cadres. At the moment, we have seven seminaries. Even though this is more than in the past, we hope to be able to increase this number. The prospects for the future are good.

DER SPIEGEL: But it was worse in the past. During the 70 years since the October Revolution, hundreds of churches have been destroyed; others were abused as grain stores and factories, such as the Moscow Danilov Monastery, in which you are now permitted to reside again. Is the church's struggle in the Soviet Union at an end once and for all?

Filaret: Yes, this is past for us; even more—past perfect.

SPIEGEL: Thousands of church officials and simple believers were opposed, discriminated against, imprisoned, and even killed by the Soviet power, just because of their religious views. Is the newly won freedom of your church now great enough to talk openly about this dark period?

Filaret: There is no doubt about this, but we use our church language, of course. In our Christian view, too, this was a difficult time, but also a holy time. A Christian's life always means bearing a cross. Ioannis Khristostomos said: For the church, freedom is worse than persecution. This is religious dialectics....

SPIEGEL: ...With which any repression can be justified as the will of God.

Filaret: This is not a question of justification. In hard times the Christian sees the truth and the true friends. Therefore, misery is not only negative for us.

SPIEGEL: Are there still prisoners held captive in the Soviet Union for their religious beliefs today?

Filaret: No, and this is the objective truth. There have never been such prisoners: No one has ever been imprisoned because of his belief. There are millions of people who go to church. I am one of them, and I have always loyally stood by the church, by Christ, and by my belief. Sometimes this was difficult, but I have never violated any laws.

However, those who considered their religious belief as an antithesis to the ruling regime and became criminals were naturally punished. But, meanwhile, almost all these people have been released again. I know of only one Orthodox Christian who is still in prison.

SPIEGEL: During your recent visit to Upper Bavaria's Puch, you spoke about "millions and millions of religious people" in the Soviet Union. How many are there in reality?

Filaret: This is difficult to answer. There are no exact figures, and approximate figures vary—sometimes there are 1 million more, sometimes 1 million less.

SPIEGEL: One million plus or minus how many?

Filaret: At our synod it became known that 30 million children have been baptized in less than 2 decades. Figures are not so important for us. It is a fact that our churches are always crammed full. In my church in Minsk, there are at least 100 baptisms every Saturday and Sunday.

SPIEGEL: Will the improved atmosphere between church and state in the future also benefit the less privileged religious communities—for instance, Muslims, Jews, Old Catholics, Catholics, or Baptists?

Filaret: Perestroika benefits everyone and puts no one at a disadvantage. In the past the Baptists, for instance, had problems because they refused state registration of their communities. But since they realized that this registration does not mean a renunciation of their belief, they have been more successful than we are in founding new communities.

SPIEGEL: At your synod in the traditional monastery of Sagorsk, the lack of restructuring within the Orthodox Church was criticized. There is too little Christian literature, too few Bibles, too little openness within the church. Can the church learn something from the policy of perestroika of the Communist Gorbachev?

Filaret: I think so, yes. Many of the new stimuli—and thus the awareness of our new opportunities—have not yet gained ground at the local level. You see: I, as the governing bishop of Belorussia, have meanwhile been able to consecrate seven new communities. The overcoming of old, in particular bureaucratic attitudes, toward which perestroika strives, is also necessary for the church. Clergymen, too, are fallible men. Gorbachev's enthusiasm, his loyalty to the idea of restructuring are so admirable that he challenges us Christians to follow him.

SPIEGEL: Can you imagine that in the future a Communist can also be a Christian in the Soviet Union—and vice versa?

Filaret: Yes, I can. For me, a key question is: Why can't a Christian be a member of the Communist Party? And another aspect would be whether a Communist must necessarily be an atheist, since in a certain way, the original Christian credo could be a model for communism.

SPIEGEL: Are you a member of the CPSU, or would you like to be one if it were possible?

Filaret: Of course, I am not a Communist, at least not in the sense of the doctrine of our Communist Party, which is an atheist one. Besides, I think that a religious person does not need a party because our church...

SPIEGEL: ...is a party itself?

Filaret: No, no, not that. Only in the widest and most worldly sense there are, perhaps, certain similarities. [passage omitted]

SPIEGEL: Is there no danger of alienation between church dignitaries and the religious rank and file?

Filaret: God forbid. We have excellent relations with our believers: They have always understood very well that the difficult problems between state and church in this country can be solved only gradually and that these relations had to be knitted loop by loop, so to speak.

SPIEGEL: There is no place, then, for a Christian-nationalist pattern, which some of your Ukrainian believers favor, who were forcibly united with the Russian-Orthodox Church in 1946?

Filaret: Such opposition movements, which are stirred from outside, are bad, very bad—bad for the state, for society, and also for the church. Our 1,000-year-old history knows of many examples of such interventions, not only with the sword, not only with guns, not only with tanks, planes, and missiles, but also with ideological diversion. And all this dissension is also a kind of intervention.

Of course, in the church—like in society, in general—there are good, constructive movements that press for changes and work to eliminate misunderstandings. But then there are also the others, who work for a foreign uncle with poison and malice, and without love for their homeland. [passage omitted]

SPIEGEL: What do you specifically expect of the new law on freedom of conscience that was announced by General Secretary Gorbachev and is to replace the regulations of 1929 that are inimical to the church and were last amended under Brezhnev in 1975?

Filaret: I would not call these regulations inimical to the church. They reflected the specific situation in our country at that time, the tensions that had accumulated in Russia. Now the time lies new, and it is clear that now we need new legal regulations for the relations between state and church.

SPIEGEL: Which ones?

Filaret: can hardly talk about something which I have not yet read. But I hope that it will be good. Anyway, we are looking into the future with optimism, and Andrey Gromyko, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium,

recently confirmed that these new laws are to be expected in the very near future and that our synod, but also other religious groups, will be consulted before they are passed.

SPIEGEL: What is the priority item on your list of wishes?

Filaret: Of course, complete recognition as a legal entity. At present this is the most important thing for religious organizations. In certain areas we already have the corresponding rights—for instance, in building new churches or in buying property, such as means of transportation. But this has not been set down in any laws so far.

And then the ban on charitable activities must be eliminated. Every citizen in our country is permitted, even encouraged, to engage in private charitable activities; only the church has been forbidden to do so up to now. But here, too, it is gradually becoming clear that dedication, cordiality, and an individual approach is necessary to really help people in need—and that this is one of the most noble tasks of the church.

SPIEGEL: Your Eminence, thank you for this interview.

Demichev Presents Awards to Orthodox Clergy
PM2006113188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
11 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Presentation of Awards"]

[Text] A ceremony held in the Kremlin on 10 June convincingly attested to the rigorous implementation of the Soviet state's Leninist policy with regard to religion, the church, and believers based on the principles of freedom of conscience and genuine equality of rights for our country's citizens. Senior members of the clergy—prominent figures in the Russian Orthodox Church who have had the Soviet Union's high awards conferred on them in the year of the portentous 1,000th anniversary of the Christianization of Rus—were invited to St Catherine's Hall in the Great Kremlin Palace.

P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, presented Orders of the Labor Red Banner to Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and All Russia, Metropolitan Filaret of Kiev and Galich, Metropolitan Aleksiy of Leningrad and Novgorod, Archbishop Nikolay of Gorkiy and Arzamas, and Archbishop Aleksandr of Dmitrov.

Orders of the Friendship of the Peoples were presented to Metropolitan Vladimir of Rostov and Novocherkassk, Metropolitan Sergiy of Odessa and Kherson, Metropolitan Aleksiy of Kalinin and Kashin, Metropolitan Leonid of Riga and Latvia, Metropolitan Nikodim of Lvov

and Ternopol, Archbishop German of Berlin and Central Europe, Archbishop Kirill of Smolensk and Vyazma, Archbishop Lazar of Argentina and South America, Bishop Kliment of Serpukhov, and Bishop Vladimir of Podolsk.

Presenting the awards, P.N. Demichev pointed out that the anniversary festivities devoted to the millennium of the Christianization of Rus are of broad sociopolitical significance and arouse very lively public interest in our country and abroad.

Today's act, he emphasized, acknowledges the personal contribution of each of you to the cause of strengthening peace, friendship, and mutual understanding among the peoples and attests to the lofty feelings of civic duty and patriotism inherent in you. The church in our country is separate from the state. However, this does not, of course, rule out but, on the contrary, envisages its participation in resolving the problems facing Soviet society. Restructuring, glasnost, and democratization have not left believers indifferent either, for they do not dissociate themselves from their homeland but share their fate with it both in joy and in times of grim trials and contribute to its renewal as far as they are able. We welcome the desire of the church to find its place in this process of restructuring and to activate its participation in various public organizations which set themselves noble, humanist goals.

Considerable credit for the fact that the world's slide toward a nuclear apocalypse has been halted today goes also to religious organizations, P.N. Demichev continued. Warmly congratulating the recipients, he voiced the hope that the celebration of the millennium of the Christianization of Rus will serve the cause of strengthening mutual understanding and friendship among the peoples and give a new boost to progress toward the goal we have set of greeting the 21st century without nuclear weapons.

Patriarch Pimen expressed gratitude for the high assessment of the activity of the Russian Orthodox Church, emphasizing its determination to continue patriotic service for the good of the homeland and peace and in the interests of preserving the sacred gift of life. We, he said, are witnesses to and participants in beneficial changes in the life of our society. The fruits of the policy of restructuring, democratization, and glasnost are already having a favorable influence on the life of our people. We perceive with profound enthusiasm, the patriarch declared, the restoration of the Leninist principles of the attitude toward religion and the church.

T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and K.M. Kharchev, chairman of the Council for Religious Affairs under the USSR Council of Ministers, participated in the ceremony.

Shcherbitskiy Speaks on Restructuring
PM2006101988 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
11 Jun 88 Morning Edition p2

[TASS report: "Unite the Collectives on the Basis of Restructuring Ideas"]

[Text] Like the rest of the country, the Ukraine has begun a broad, creative discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th all-union party conference. At open meetings in primary and shop-level party organizations, party groups, and labor collectives, Communists and nonparty people are trying to give a businesslike interpretation to the achievements to date during the years of restructuring in the country as a whole and in their own collectives, critically analyze accumulated experience, and outline ways to solve current problems as soon as possible.

Ways to give creative work a new, powerful boost and increase working people's activeness in solving political and economic tasks were the subject of a meaningful discussion at an open party meeting of the collective of the Kiev S.P. Korolev Production Association tool making shop. V.V. Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, took part in its work.

The report by I.V. Grushko, secretary of the shop's party organization, and speeches noted that the shop and the party organization began a lively discussion of the Theses in sectors, teams, and party groups the day after they were published. Party group organizers, propaganda workers, and agitators have shown initiative. The party bureau is receiving proposals from Communists and nonparty people. The party organization has formed a commission to study and generalize their proposals. There is general approval of the party policy geared to frank dialogue with the people. They welcome openness, glasnost, and a broad exchange of opinions. Their interest in social life has increased.

But something else is also clear: The old way of thinking is too deeply rooted, does not wish to give way, and is only slowly surrendering the positions it has gained. The new way of thinking does not come easily, and so it is simpler to follow the well worn rut, which ultimately slows things down. This is the second year the association has been working in conditions of full economic accountability. However, real economic accountability has yet to be achieved, including in the tool making shop and in the teams. Speakers discussed the need to form contract-based collectives for the development, introduction, and manufacture of equipment and for the manufacture of new products on an economically accountable basis. There has been no substantial change in the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, and there is an acute need to replace equipment.

While discussing the CPSU Central Committee Theses, speakers spoke out in favor of the need to reform Soviet society's political system as soon as possible and involve the broad masses of working people in the management of all state and social affairs. They pointed out that the labor collective councils elected in the shop and at the plant are very timid about developing their activity. The same can also be said of other social organizations.

A large part of the meeting was devoted to discussing restructuring in the party, the return to Leninist principles of party leadership of society, and the development of internal party democracy.

I approve of the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th all-union party conference, which will examine the most important issues of our life, V.A. Rakhuba, deputy chief of the shop and CPSU member, said in his speech. All party and government documents adopted in the course of my adult life have also been to the point. And our society needed them. But they all either worked for just a short space of time or did not work at all. Because there was nothing very democratic about their adoption. Today, in the conditions of restructuring, the party consults with the people when drawing up important documents, is learning to be democratic, and is teaching us to be democratic at the same time.

The speaker proposed that tenure of elective office in the CPSU be limited to only two 5-year terms with no exceptions and that everyone, from party bureau secretary right up to general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, be elected in a closed secret ballot at a party meeting, party conference, or party congress. He emphasized the need to further expand glasnost in the work of the CPSU Central Committee and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and improve the level of information among CPSU members on questions of domestic and foreign policy, as well as the importance of more fully studying and considering public opinion.

These proposals were supported by L.V. Vashchenko, polisher and CPSU member, on behalf of the collective of the polishing sector. All of us—party members and non-party people, the speaker said, impatiently await the all-union party conference and set great store by it. After all, we do not yet have a mechanism guaranteeing the irreversibility of restructuring. The party conference must create this mechanism and the guarantee that restructuring is irreversible.

The Theses, speakers said, raise the fundamental issue of demarcating the functions of party and soviet bodies. They also indicate the need to put an end to unwarranted tutelage by raykoms and gorkoms over rayispolkoms and gorispolkoms and fully restore the powers of soviets, as sovereign bodies representing the people.

As a rayon soviet deputy, P.I. Serdyuk, nonparty person and polisher, said, I often encounter formalism and indifference, and sometimes even frank reluctance on

the part of some leaders and working people to perform their official duties. A deputy often resembles a suppliant in his efforts to fulfill mandates and meet the wishes of the electorate. The reason for this is that deputies are treated as minor individuals with no real authority. Or else preference is given to the ispolkom which holds the real power in the rayon, makes all the decisions, and controls deputies' activity.

There is an urgent need to change the electoral system. We must ensure that the voters have the opportunity to elect the most worthy candidate, and every candidate must submit his program of activity to the soviet. Not only labor collectives but also social organizations and house and apartment committees should be given the opportunity to nominate candidate deputies. In the opinion of the speaker, it would be expedient to nominate deputies in the area in which they live, as this more fully reflects the interests of the electorate. We must give the soviets full power, place them above executive bodies and their apparatuses, and create soviet presidiums which will be responsible for organizing and coordinating the work of deputies and commissions.

As the speaker emphasized, the Theses correctly discuss the need to improve coordination between local soviet and labor collective council activity. There are still frequent cases where ministries and departments try to solve problems of economic and social development without considering the broad opinion of the working people.

The meeting stressed that the demarcation of functions is also topical for enterprises. This kind of demarcation should exist between the administration, party and trade union committees, labor collective council, and other social organizations. We must eradicate the practice whereby the party committee and bureau of shop party organizations usurp the administration and shop committee to deal with strictly economic issues and assume responsibility for their solution. Political work suffers as a result of this, as there is simply not enough time.

A.G. Petukhov, lathe operator and nonparty person; S.V. Yunga, tool maker and CPSU member; and others devoted their speeches to the role of the labor collective and its social organizations.

Approving of the CPSU Central Committee decision regarding the nationwide discussion of the Theses for the all-union party conference and raising the topical issue of renewing all spheres of social life, the participants in the meeting expressed the thought that Communists' responsibility for the fate of restructuring and the state of affairs in the collective, rayon, city, and country is now greater than it has ever been. They proposed various measures needed to increase the activeness and initiative of CPSU members, such as making more exacting

demands on them and more extensively employing the practice whereby members submit reports at party bureau sessions and have their party references discussed and confirmed.

The meeting noted that Communists have the task of breaking people's stagnant outlook and establishing the belief that the individual is really—not just in words—becoming the main factor of material and spiritual development and its aim. This can only be achieved by enhancing the party's authority and conducting painstaking, individual work in every party group, every party organization, and every labor collective.

The meeting was addressed by V.V. Shcherbitskiy. A total of 891 delegates have been elected from the republic party organization to the 19th all-union party conference, he said, which will be examining issues of exceptional importance to the life of the party and the whole country. The delegates were elected by secret ballot at obkom plenums and a Kiev Gorkom plenum in line with the resolution adopted by the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum.

By submitting the Theses for a nationwide discussion, the CPSU Central Committee has tried to involve all Soviet people in the job of drawing up a constructive program to deepen restructuring. More than 30,000 meetings involving more than 1.5 million Communists and nonparty people have already been held in the republic. Many proposals have been put forward.

The time that has passed since the 27th CPSU Congress and analysis of the discussion of the Central Committee Theses show, the speaker noted, that the people clearly support the party line of further developing democratization, broadening glasnost, improving our entire political system, restoring the Leninist interpretation of the principle of democratic centralism, changing the functions and structure of party bodies, and limiting tenure of elective office to two terms. They also support party measures to improve the country's national economy and carry out radical economic reform.

At the same time, a considerable number of speakers spoke against the demagogic elements that were apparent during the discussions and against attempts to impose the opinion that no positive changes have really been made, especially in the economy, and that restructuring is marking time. All this is evidence of shortcomings and oversights in work with people.

The meetings are devoting particular attention to the democratization of party and social life. Why have these issues come to the forefront? Experience has convincingly shown that all previous attempts at reform were not carried through precisely because socialism's main potential—the initiative and independent activity of the masses—was not used to the full.

Drawing lessons from our history, since the Central Committee April (1985) Plenum the CPSU Central Committee Politburo has consistently conducted a policy to revive Leninist principles in party and state activity and develop democracy and glasnost. This is a guarantee that restructuring is irreversible. Of course, this primarily requires the party itself to creatively reinterpret its functions as the leading, organizing force in Soviet society and the political vanguard of the people and develop methods of leadership that accord with the qualitatively new conditions.

One of the most complex problems in practice is to clearly demarcate the functions of party, soviet, and economic bodies. This is not the first time this task has been set. But it has never been completely solved. Consequently the conference intends to consider proposals on the kind of political mechanisms and guarantees which would really ensure the demarcation of functions and allow the party to concentrate its attention on developing its political course and on cadre, organizational, and educational work among the masses.

It is proposed to seriously restructure the activity of all party bodies and change their structure and work methods. Naturally this also concerns primary party organizations. Their main task is still to implement party policy. This must not be done by issuing commands and reprimands but by selecting the most suitable cadres, convincing people, uniting collectives on the basis of restructuring ideas, and creating an atmosphere of creative search and great responsibility in these collectives. All this requires active effort from every Communist.

It is also important to ensure that a party organization shows its worth in real action to solve key tasks in the collective's life and activity. In this respect, all good work must be carried through, once begun, and more initiative shown. Then people will be able to see that the party organization is really working and taking the lead in restructuring.

The first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee went on to note that negative trends in the republic's national economy—as in the country as a whole—have been broken. Real measures have been taken to improve the financial situation of sectors of the national economy and reduce the number of loss-making and low-profit production units. The pace at which fixed assets are being renewed is increasing.

In 2 years, the growth in output volumes and labor productivity has exceeded the 5-year plan targets. For the first time, all growth in industrial output has been achieved without increasing the number of workers. The growth rate of labor productivity is considerably higher than growth in wages. The average annual gross agricultural output has increased by 7.1 percent against 2.5 percent in the last 5-year period. Since the beginning of the 5-year period, profits of R2.5 billion have been secured in excess of the plan.

Economic growth rates and qualitative development indicators are being affected to an increasing extent by the work of enterprises and organizations which have transferred to economic accountability and self-financing. They now account for some 60 percent of the republic's total industrial output. In this group of enterprises, growth in output volume and labor productivity exceeded plan targets in the first 5 months of this year and was considerably higher than that of enterprises not working in the new conditions. Indicators registering the quality and technical standard of output have improved. However, there have still been no radical improvements in the republic's economic development, although preconditions for this do exist.

Of course, the fact that we are having to conduct the reform on the move, so to speak, while still tied to a 5-year plan which was drawn up much earlier, is taking its toll. We cannot fail to take account of the fact that the overwhelming majority of enterprises have only been operating in the conditions of economic independence for a year. Nevertheless, this is not the only reason why economic reform is not producing the kind of results we would have liked. Labor collectives' initiative is still not really given free rein, and the state order has been broadened without justification.

As is well known, the speaker said, the CPSU Central Committee and Soviet Government are doing a great deal to accelerate the solution of the main economic reform tasks. Of course, this takes time and a great deal of complicated organizational work. In this respect, a very great deal depends on local bodies and on the leaders and party organizations of industrial enterprises.

Intensive factors are still by no means being used to the full while the achievements of scientific and technical progress and various forms of contract and cooperative work are only slowly being introduced. In your own shop, for example, there is still some work to be done to establish full internal economic accountability and to form teams working on a contract basis. The retooling of production is also moving slowly. There is some work here for the party organization and leadership of the shop and the association. The shop's labor collective council is being slow to become involved in resolving these problems.

One of the main priorities in party activity, V.V. Shcherbitskiy went on to note, is a strong social policy. Since the beginning of the 5-year period, the republic has found an additional R2.7 billion for the development of the social sphere. In 2 years, the growth in wages and in payments and benefits from public funds has exceeded the 5-year plan indicators.

The republic has drawn up an integrated, targeted program known as "Housing-2000" which provides for the construction of 338 million square metres of housing. Of this, 63 percent will be built by contract organizations, 15 percent by the own resources method, and 22 percent

by individual builders. In the course of 3 years, some 10 million square metres of housing in excess of the 5-year plan will be commissioned using state capital investments. This will bring forward housewarmings for almost 1 million people. A considerable amount of work is also being done to expand the services available to the population, including by means of organizing various cooperatives.

But there are still a great many problems, particularly regarding food supplies for the population, consumer and medical services, and the organization of housing repair work. The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and the republic's government are constantly—you could say every day—trying to solve these problems. However, the food program and the integrated program for goods and services are not being implemented to the full in a number of important aspects. We are encouraged by the fact that this year the republic's agriculture is shaping up quite well. In most oblasts, the situation in the fields is better than last year. There will be grain and feed, livestock breeding productivity will increase, and the people will see an improvement in food supplies.

While carrying out radical economic reform, the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and Ukrainian Council of Ministers are devoting special attention to the task of improving national economic management. A new general scheme of management has been developed. The role played by local soviets in managing the socioeconomic development of territories under their jurisdiction is increasing.

Nine ministries and departments are being axed, and more than one-third of structural subdivisions at republic level are being abolished. The number of oblsipolkom administrations and departments is also being reduced by one-third. Measures are being taken to regulate management at rayon and city level and also at the basic level—directly at the enterprises.

In conclusion, V.V. Shcherbitskiy stressed that the task of restructuring is complex but that the path chosen is the right one, and the plans made are tough but realistic. There can be no question of going back. That is why we must now think about how we are going to realize every clause in the Theses, deepen restructuring, and improve and renew our socialist society.

A resolution was passed on the issue discussed, in which the shop's Communists approved the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th all-union party conference, by and large, and instructed the shop's party bureau to generalize all proposals and observations made during the discussion of the Theses and convey them to the association's party committee for official registration and submission to higher party bodies.

Kiev Public Debates Restructuring Issues
PM2006112788 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA
in Russian 7 Jun 88 pp 1, 4

[Unattributed report on 17 May "Meeting Between SOVETSKAYA KULTURA and Readers in Kiev": "The Intelligentsia and Restructuring"]

[Excerpts] Question from the audience: "Don't the newspaper's articles remain a voice crying in the wilderness? Isn't their point lost if after publication the things criticized stay the same?"

Answer from editorial office: "They don't stay the same. Some people mistakenly imagine that after every newspaper publication girders must crash to the ground somewhere, walls crack, and so forth. But just look around at the exceptional interest in the problems of glasnost and democracy being shown here—there's not an inch of room! Your energy, exactingness, and, finally, even the fact that you would not have come to such a meeting with such fervor even 1 year ago—surely all this is evidence of at least a small part of the work that the newspaper is doing, is it not?"

We have already reported on the SOVETSKAYA KULTURA readers' conference on the topic "The Intelligentsia and Restructuring" held in Kiev on 17 May. It lasted several hours and generated great public interest in the city.

The editorial office was represented by the following: G. Kondratenko, deputy chief editor; G. Terekhova and G. Dubasov, members of the editorial office; O. Gusev, own correspondent for the Ukraine; and the following regular contributors to the newspaper—Doctor of Philosophical Sciences A. Butenko, movie director S. Govorukhin, Doctor of Historical Sciences N. Popov, and art critic V. Glazychyev.

The following took part in the meeting: Poet B. Oleynik, chairman of the Ukrainian Cultural Foundation; Yu. Mushketik, first secretary of the Ukrainian SSR Writers Union Board; N. Donchenko, secretary of the Kiev Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom; writers Ye. Dudar and A. Musiyenko; composer I. Karabits; movie director N. Mashchenko, director of the A.P. Dovzhenko Movie studio; USSR People's Artist A. Mokrenko; V. Fialko, secretary of the Ukrainian SSR Theater Workers Union; USSR People's Artist T. Yablonskaya; Professor I. Brazhnik of Kiev University; S. Koltunuk, Ukrainian SSP first deputy minister of culture; I. Zavrayskiy, chief of the Kiev Ukrainian Communist Party Gorkom Culture Department; A. Kovalenko, chief of the (Chernobyl AES) department of information and international ties; and others.

Extracts from some speeches and some of the answers to questions from the audience are to be found on page 4. [passage omitted]

Yevgeniy Dudar, writer:

I am very grateful to SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, which gave "political asylum" to my article "The Virus of Irresponsibility," which was devoted to problems involved in developing the atomic power industry, since other publications I asked to print it had turned it down every time upon reading the words "the people are not a penal battalion."

I would ask the newspaper to continue asking trenchant questions, particularly as all kinds of bureaucratic devices are being used to try to convince us that the "peaceful atom" is still first-rate....

We know that the Chigirinskiy AES is now being built, despite the opinion of the broad public of the Ukraine. Alarming reports are coming from Rovno. The oblast newspaper CHERVONIY PRAPOT has carried an article by a specialist from the station claiming that the wrong site has been chosen for the Rovno AES. The station is located where sinkholes and caverns are constantly forming in the karst. Liquid concrete is now being pumped into them to prevent the station from subsid- ing.... [passage omitted]

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Anatoliy Butenko:

The events and changes taking place in our country today have no historical parallel. An enormous country which experienced the most profound revolution in 1917 is now again gripped by change. This is already, as you and I know, the second such attempt to be made. The first was made at the 20th congress, and it failed. There were many reasons for that, but those bureaucratic forces which last time gave restructuring no opportunity to fully develop are the same forces that are today trying to put a brake on our progress. The two most relevant questions today are the Stalin question and the question of our social structure.

Do we need to know whether Stalin was a Marxist-Leninist or not? We have much information right now that enables us to state Stalin was not a Marxist. He was a man who committed a crime against socialism, diverged from Leninism in many very important respects, and revised Leninism. The Leninist concept of socialism was repudiated by Stalin and replaced by Stalin's vision of socialism.

Moving to the second question: What sort of social system do we have?

Stalin was fully justified in saying at the end of the thirties that socialism had been basically built in our country. But what kind of socialism? Stalinist, bureaucratic socialism. If we fail to grasp that, we will fail to grasp the point of restructuring. Restructuring means that we must change and restructure in a revolutionary way our legacy of Stalinist, regimented socialism. Some people wonder why we talk a lot about Stalin today and

less about Brezhnev, a more recent figure. But, after all, what was done under Brezhnev took shape in the thirties. The concepts whose consequences we are now suffering formed then. So, whether we like it or not, we have to study our history. It is not a matter of desire on our part but of duty.

Ivan Brazhnik, professor of Kiev University:

Departmentalism is, in my view, one of the greatest evils today. I regard departmentalism as the most substantial element of the administer-and-command system of coercion, departmentalism as selfish corporativism opposing the interests of the party, state, and society as a whole.

How is it to be overcome? I have the following suggestions. I have drawn attention to the fact that the newspaper has of late published articles on party and current affairs more often. The article by Comrade Manayenkov, first secretary of the Lipetsk party obkom, for example. He suggests eliminating sector departments in party committees and leaving only party organizational work and ideology departments. A correct suggestion! But once you have said "A", you have to go on and talk about "B" and "C." Since it is an obkom first secretary speaking, it is clearly party obkoms that are being discussed here. But I am convinced that there should be no sector departments in the CPSU Central Committee either. They express, generate, and establish departmentalism.

Now for "B." Why do we never see any critical articles about the Politburo in the press? Who is going to criticize it, if we don't? We have not criticized for a long time now, and the consequences are well known. It is easy to criticize the dead. I am convinced that working leaders want to know our opinion.

I will ask all of you a question: Who among you understands about mixed feed? Two, three, perhaps four of you. But here sitting alongside me is a party obkom secretary, and although he is in charge of ideology, he has to know about mixed feed.... Not because of his job but because the Politburo makes decisions on mixed feed. But is it proper for the Politburo to take such a decision? There is the Council of Ministers: Let it deal with mixed feed. I want the Politburo to be political, not politico-economic. People will retort to me—and I have already heard those objections—that our mixed feed situation is bad, that it needs to be brought up to scratch. I believe that the ministers who brought the mixed feed situation to such a pass should be removed from their offices. [passage omitted]

Doctor of Historical Sciences Nikolay Popov:

Many readers want to know how to rule out a monopoly of power and ensure full and effective criticism of party policy.

In my view, the way to guarantee it lies in the separation of power. This is one of the basic questions that will be discussed at the party conference. We have enough soviet and economic organs to direct all economic processes. Duplication in this sphere is counterproductive.

I think that de-Stalinization is undoubtedly the most acute issue. If we are to appear honest in the eyes of our younger generation and the whole world we must separate Stalinism from Communism in a clear and frank way. For very many people in the world they are identical. And if such a concept as national pride exists, the concept of national shame must also undoubtedly exist. We allowed that, and we must be the ones to rid ourselves of it.

Questions and Answers [subhead]

[Question] Would you say why there has been no public apology made to those now released?

N. Popov: All innocent people who have suffered must, of course, be publicly pardoned, and a party commission is now working on that. The main figures, the main, well-known politicians will be pardoned, and this will be done publicly. At the same time we have hundreds of thousands, if not millions of people who suffered and information about whom has been lost altogether. If a politician was killed, his wife died, and his children perished—then no trace is now left. But we must remember those people too. If there is a tomb of the unknown soldier, there should be, if you like, a tomb of the unknown victim of repression.

[Question] All this restructuring is for the intelligentsia. They have been given the opportunity to talk and talk, but we still have no meat or butter.

N. Popov: The butter problem goes back, strange though it may seem, to Stalinism. Until we settle accounts with it, we will be unable to make progress. Everything is interconnected. And it is the duty of our generation—you and us—and of those who are younger and older than we to put paid to the ignominious, sad, and unhappy aspects of our legacy. Until we have utterly renounced and done away with the system that was created, we will be unable to do anything.

[Question] From the audience: Do cadres have to be changed?

[Answer] Cadres undoubtedly have to be changed. But how are you going to change the cadres? Elections are the only way in a democratic system. Unfortunately, we do not yet know how, indeed do not very much want to use the electoral system.

I would also like to answer those who say that it is time to forget the past, Stalin, the personality cult, the repressions.... First, there are crimes to which the statute of

limitations does not apply. I am against new repressions. But our main weapon now is glasnost. The country must know who the scoundrels are.

[Question] Do you not think that it is time to remove Stalin's remains from outside the Kremlin Wall?

N. Popov: In my view, Stalin should be removed to a public cemetery, where ordinary people are buried; everyone is entitled to a plot of earth after death. Everyone, as is well known, is buried. Some people, true, have been ignominiously dispatched from whence they came. But we can't do that: They are all our own people. But the question does not only concern Stalin. Vyshinskiy, by the way, and others whose role in the repressions is yet to be revealed lie by the Kremlin Wall. What actually is to be done when it is revealed that a particular person is unworthy to lie by the Kremlin Wall. I honestly do not know. One must first investigate their role in history and then investigate their place in the cemetery.

[Question] We should be talking and writing not about purging the party but about the need to open the party's doors, to encourage comrades to leave the party to reduce members' average age, and to step up activity. Let them leave with the right to recommend who is to replace them.

N. Popov: In principle I would say the suggestion is acceptable. And such comrades might be found, but I doubt it.... Party membership should clearly not be an absolutely mandatory or extremely desirable requirement for someone to occupy particular high posts.

[Question] Is an obligatory state ideology necessary, in your view?

N. Popov: Ideology is undoubtedly necessary; it exists in every society. Our ideology is Marxist-Leninist. Despite all the distorted and dogmatic revampings and interpretations of it, the underlying principles of Marxism-Leninism remain invariable. It is quite another matter that until recently our ideology was, as has been correctly said here, the state ideology, so to speak, and obligatory for all; it was transformed in our country into a form of religion. It was impossible to investigate or research the state of that ideology, despite Marx himself saying that our theory was not a dogma and that all subsequent generations would change and develop it. We forgot this. Our science must be a science, not a faith.

[Question] Do you think that direct election of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman is possible?

N. Popov: We need, I think, in general to carry out a democratic reform of every detail of our electoral system. Multiple candidates representing different public organizations are necessary in all elections. It is essential for them to conduct open and clearly defined election campaigns.

[Question] Does the Ukraine have a nationalities problem? If so, what are the tasks that cultural figures must resolve?

I. Brazhnik: I think that so long as there are nations there will be a nationalities problem. Only narrow-minded people have been able to say that the nationalities question has been solved in a country where nations exist. If you are asking how I see cultural figures' tasks, the main thing is to protect and augment our national riches. If we do not protect the diversity of national cultures which exist in our country, we will all be the poorer for it. I believe that the main task is to protect and augment. And at the same time cultural figures must consider how, while protecting and augmenting national culture, to prevent its becoming isolated and what to do to ensure that national elements unite rather than divide us.

[Question] What do you think—and I want you to be completely frank: Is there any hope that restructuring will triumph?

A. Butenko: There is not yet a mechanism guaranteeing the irreversibility of the restructuring processes. We are therefore hoping that the party conference will create the mechanism and create guarantees of restructuring's irreversibility. [passage omitted]

[Question] Kiev has a Brezhnev Square. Do you consider this normal?

V. Glazychov: You know, in all honesty, I am quite indifferent to it. And the fact that Mariupol is called Zhdanov leaves me cold.

[Question] We criticize "problems," but those who create them are often left untouched.

G. Kondratenko: True. Newspapers must get to the bottom of things. If a bad decision has been made, who made it? If an instruction has been issued that something be covered up or banned, who issued the order and why? Let us explain ourselves openly rather than hiding behind the authority of a powerful institution. In short, it is necessary to combat the facelessness, anonymity, and impersonality which hedgers and incompetents find it very convenient to hide behind.

[Question] I have a suggestion to make to the newspaper; namely, that it expand its "Our Opinion" rubric.

G. Kondratenko: It is possible. We do not publish even one-fifth of what we receive. We try to give what is most topical and addressed to the largest circle of readers.

[Question] I would like to suggest that a rubric called "Democratic Standards" be introduced and that it describe, for example, the appropriate recall of soviet deputies who fail to justify the trust placed in them. This is a process that takes place out of sight at present.

G. Kondratenko: The proposal is being examined. There have been attempts to show this already. But if the process of democratization continues to develop, have no doubt that the newspaper will not neglect this.

[Question] Kiev newspapers are mainly concerned, in my opinion, with studiously not noticing restructuring.

A. Butenko: We must all take care to ensure that restructuring advances more quickly in every republic. Here I would say: Why don't you criticize your own publications in the central press, as many others do? Why not act in that way if you are dissatisfied with your own press? You should not pass the buck.

[Question] An incident drawn from life. A worker at an enterprise says: "What is all this restructuring? The intelligentsia has been given free rein to chatter, while nothing has changed here." How would you answer that person?

G. Kondratenko: I would say that that is the whole problem. Many people wait for someone from outside to come along and instill order at their enterprise. They themselves must do it, not someone else.

Tajik Supreme Soviet Personnel Changes Noted
LD2006092388 Dushanbe Domestic Service in Tadzhik
1600 GMT 10 Jun 88

[Excerpts] The 8th Session of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th Convocation continued in Dushanbe on 10 June. The meeting of the session began at 1100, and was chaired by Deputy Nazarov, chairman of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet. [passage omitted]

The Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet adopted laws and decisions concerning the decrees of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet appointed Deputy Kurbanov as member of the Supreme Soviet Presidium. The Supreme Soviet appointed Deputy Vakhidov as first deputy chairman of the Tajik SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Tajik SSR State Agro-Industrial Committee. The Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet introduced some changes to the structure of some Supreme Soviet standing commissions. Deputy Nazarov was relieved of the post of chairman of the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet in light of his appointment as Tajik SSR minister of national education.

Thereupon, the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet session ended its work.

'Mass Binge' Leaves 10 Dead, 80 Hospitalized
LD2006132088 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1200 GMT 20 Jun 88

[Text] The TASS correspondent in the Ukraine reports on current news:

Ten dead, more than 80 hospitalized—this was the tragic outcome of a mass binge in Zaboloty village, Lyubomirskiy Rayon, Volhynia Oblast. This is how the drama started. The sovkhos mechanic took some furniture home for the village school principal Anishchik. To mark the occasion, they drank some liquor that the host had on hand.

The next day the mechanic died. The school principal did not feel at all well either but, fearing for his reputation, kept quiet. He merely told his wife that if he was not feeling better in the morning she should take him to the hospital. He never saw that morning.

Here the alarm should have been sounded and medical experts consulted. A person died for no apparent reason in the prime of life. But it was not done.

The poison appeared in the decanters along with the other liquor on the tables at the principal's funeral breakfast. More than 100 people gathered and it turned into a binge. Fresh misfortune did not take long to strike. The next morning a tractor driver died. They did not manage to get a woman to a first aid post. Several people died the next day and the day after that in the hospital.

At the public prosecutor's insistence, forensic tests were done. The diagnosis was poisoning by industrial-grade alcohol, which its owner had, according to relatives, picked up on the black market.

What happened threw light on something the local authorities could not bring themselves to acknowledge: The campaign against drunkenness and moonshining in the village and the surrounding area had been replaced by a show campaign. A sober way of life was affirmed only on paper here.

'Dogmatism' Seen as Root of Political Ills
PM2006134188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
10 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 3

[Part one of article by Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor L. Ponomarev, and Candidate of Philosophical Sciences V. Shinkarenko under the rubric "The 19th Party Conference. Reflections on the CPSU Central Committee Theses": "Dogmatism. The Roots and the Fruits"—boldface as published]

[Text] I. [subhead]

Today Soviet people are clearly aware that the revolutionary renewal of society is not an easy, pleasurable stroll to the victorious roll of drums. It is a struggle, and what is more, it is a difficult struggle which is waged on many levels and demands from everyone a profound understanding of our history, the present state of society, and the prospects for its development.

In short, it is a struggle between the new and the old. Such a struggle always leads through difficulties and contradictions. The old refuses to give up without a struggle—an acute and embittered struggle at times. The CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th all-union party conference rightly note: "The vestiges of conservative, bureaucratic thinking have proved particularly tenacious. The champions of dogmatic views of socialism are slow to cede their positions."

We are learning from past mistakes how to avoid dogmatic distortions, but being poor at mastering the lessons of the past we tend, from time to time, to fall again into the trap of...dogmatism. While in the past the successes achieved by millions of people were all, without exception, ascribed to Stalin, there are quite a few people now who are ready to blame him for absolutely all abuses, mistakes, and failures.

Is this not the self-same dogmatism of Stalin's times, only in reverse?

What can one man alone achieve in history without backing—even if he is a gigantic figure? He will achieve nothing; he will simply be brushed aside. What backing did Stalin have? What social forces had an interest in indulging his unlawful excesses? What interest did they have in perpetrating these excesses in his name? Who in actual fact were the people who found a leader in Stalin? Why was the personality cult gradually transformed into a cult of office? Who stood to gain from this?

A most thorough analysis is needed of the problem of mutual relations between classes in our country, beginning with the second half of the twenties. Stalin's "theory" of the exacerbation of class struggle in the process of building socialism has rightly been condemned as erroneous. At the time, it served as justification for the atmosphere of intolerance, hostility, and suspicion which was introduced in the country.

However, on the other hand, neither the mass repressions, nor the peasant revolts, nor the other sharp clashes of the thirties can be explained solely by the arbitrary conduct of individual people. It is obvious that behind these phenomena were the interests of large social groups—class interests and corresponding actions. Does this not mean that an exacerbation of the class struggle at that stage actually took place? Not as a natural development however, but as a reaction to deviations from Lenin's New Economic Policy, deviations which took place under pressure from Stalin? None of these questions has so far been answered by our social science.

Why did it happen that an N.S. Khrushchev cult, albeit a specialized cult, began to take shape relatively quickly? Why did our society look on silently as L.I. Brezhnev's authoritarianism began to develop and assume distorted, caricature-like forms? What role did M.A. Suslov play in

all this? Why was the emergence of little personality cults possible at local level? And, finally, why did an exactly identical situation develop in a number of other socialist countries?

Our history, it appears, is immeasurably more complex than some people would like to present it at times. It does not fit into previously drawn up frameworks. This applies to the personality of Stalin who, even at the height of his untrammelled power, had to nonetheless take account of the actual lineup of political forces. And when in danger of losing his power, he did not shrink from misleading his opponents. This is borne out, for instance, in his letter to Andreyev (to the Komsomol Central Committee State Publishing House for Children's Literature) and Smirnova (the author of "Stories About Stalin's Childhood" [Rasskazy o Detstve Stalina] which the publishing house was preparing for publication).

This letter was not published during Stalin's lifetime. It seems that it was intended for internal, so-to-speak apparatus, use. We will cite it in full from the text of the proofs of the 14th volume of Stalin's works.

"I am categorically against publication of the 'Stories about Stalin's Childhood.'"

"The book abounds in factual inaccuracies, distortions, exaggerations, and undeserved eulogies. The author has been misled by story hunters and liars, ('well-intentioned' liars though they may have been), and toadies. I feel sorry for the author, but a fact remains a fact.

"However, this is not the main point. The main point is that the book has a tendency to instill in Soviet people (and people in general) a personality cult, a leader cult, a cult of infallible heroes. And that is dangerous and harmful. The theory of 'heroes,' the theory of the 'mob' is not a Bolshevik theory; it is a theory of the Socialist-Revolutionaries. Heroes make a people; they transform a mob into a people *say the Socialist-Revolutionaries*. The people make the heroes *is the Bolsheviks' reply to the Socialist-Revolutionaries [SR's]*. The book is grist to the SR mill. Any book of this kind will be grist to the SR mill and will harm our common Bolshevik cause.

"My advice is to burn the book.

"I. Stalin.

"16 February 1938."

What is this? Stalin opposing Stalin? Opposing his own personality cult? Opposing education in the Stalinist spirit? This is how people in 1953-1956 tried to present the matter, going by the letter and ignoring the reality. The volume of Stalin's works containing this letter was practically ready for publication by 1956. It did not get

published. The 20th CPSU Congress "got in the way." After the congress, there remained no doubt as to Stalin's real attitude toward his personality cult.

Time has gone by, and the old dogmas are again surreptitiously beginning to rear their heads. Some people would very much like to believe now that it was all Stalin's fault, and his fault alone. Naturally, the reasons for this insistence are obvious. After all, it is so simple to explain everything in this manner! It is an ingrained habit! People whose thoughts revolved around one personality for decades are sometimes incapable of change. They simply cannot see anything else any more. However, such a simplification of history inevitably leads to a simplification of our understanding of reality.

Any dogmatism, including theoretical dogmatism, represents a great social danger. The selfsame theoretical dogmas are not confined to the sphere of pure science. On the contrary, they easily become part of mass consciousness. They are simple and, therefore, easily assimilated by the masses. And, having become part of mass consciousness, they assume an enormous physical force which is capable of sharply changing the course of events.

Why is restructuring marking time in many places?

Above all, because its ideas have still not taken hold of the masses to the extent which is necessary to achieve more decisive progress. The new ideas are frequently hampered by stereotypes which have taken shape under the influence of the propaganda of past times, the selfsame dogmas which held complete sway in our society in the past and were presented as allegedly scientifically founded truths, proven by practice.

This is borne out by research carried out by sociologists at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences in the course of preparations for the 19th all-union party conference. Some 25,000 people were polled—workers, kolkhoz members, members of the intelligentsia, and office workers. The opinion poll revealed that we have still not managed to overcome mass dogmatism: the dogmatism which was tirelessly fostered in the country during the years of stagnation, when conservative thinking fruitlessly revolved around a range of "truths" approved and handed down from above.

Today anyone who appraises the situation realistically cannot fail to notice that the key demands of the party on democratization of our society are by no means being fully implemented. This is also convincingly confirmed by the program set forth in the CPSU Central Committee Theses, and, of course, by the bulk of articles published in the press, by television and radio broadcasts, and by daily life itself, which is seething around the most acute questions specifically on the expansion and deepening of democratization.

So what has research shown up? It has revealed a totally unexpected picture, we would say. A fourth, a third, a half, and sometimes even more than a half of the people polled already speak of the complete success of restructuring, especially in those questions which it has still hardly touched. In doing so, they are proceeding from what has been said by the leadership and the resolutions that have been adopted. Can such a reaction be interpreted as anything but dogmatism?

One of the dogmas which was hypocritically preached from decade to decade by those who perpetrated lawlessness without bearing any responsibility for it was: In our country, all people are equal before the law. Millions of people believed this, although in reality all around them, elementary human rights were flouted. And this can happen even now.

However, now the party has raised a task which is of fundamental importance: ensuring the real equality of all Soviet people before the law, creating a legal state, a state capable of protecting its citizens against tyranny. So it is a question, essentially, of transforming the old dogma which did not correspond to the real state of affairs into a binding norm, into an immutable condition of our society's life. However, here, too, it emerged that many people regard this problem as already resolved. This is what 26.7 percent of the working people and one in five of the leaders questioned told the sociologists. What is this—jumping the gun, or hopeless backwardness?

In many people's opinion, we have already managed to achieve complete glasnost. This, in any case, is what 23.5 percent of rank-and-file workers and 18 percent of leading personnel believe. Some 23 percent and 18.1 percent, respectively, believe that there are no taboo topics regarding public debate in our country. Furthermore, 37.1 percent and 28.8 percent respectively claim that every Soviet citizen can obtain any information in which he is interested about various aspects of life in our country and abroad. But this view is clearly very far removed from reality.

But that is not the most complex question. Would anyone dare to claim that every person already has every opportunity to fully express himself, his knowledge, and his talents? No one, it seems, would claim that. However, according to the sociologists' data, there were more than 42 percent of such out-and-out optimists among the working people polled and more than a third among the leaders polled.

Highly surprising revelations came to light on the nationality question. Judging by the opinion poll data, total equality of people in all spheres of state and public life, irrespective of their national origin, is assured in our country. This is the conclusion reached after the well-known events in Alma-Ata, the Baltic Republics, and Nagorno-Karabakh. But that—namely, that everything is for the best!—is precisely what 55.5 percent of the

working people and one-half of the leading personnel believe. These are alarming statistics. They testify that the old dogmas continue to hold sway in people's minds.

And what is more is that the people who are today professing the old dogmas have no intention of discarding them. They find the orthodox views entirely satisfactory. They feel no need to change them, to acquire new knowledge. Fifty percent of working people and fifty percent of leading personnel see no need to update their knowledge.

Please note that they have stated this at the height of restructuring, when democratic principles are being introduced ever more widely in daily practice. Take, for instance, elections of leaders. They have been held in many collectives, and the people polled were well informed about this. What then was their opinion? The practice of electing production managers was fully supported by only 45.9 percent of the working people and 32.3 percent of leading personnel.

Despite all this, one in four people claimed that there was no sign of a negative attitude to innovation in their collective. This is clearly at variance with the facts.

Life has thus confirmed the correctness of the view expressed in the CPSU Central Committee Theses: "Despite all the difficulties pertaining to the switch from one system of management to another, a great deal stems from the conservative, backward thinking of a section of our managers and whole collectives, from their desire to cling to old means and methods, to live and work in the old way."

It would, of course, be naive to assume that the people who cling to dogmatic, conservative views are unfamiliar with the party documents which are critical of them. So what is the matter? Why have they not renounced their obsolete views? Why are they rejecting the new approaches? Why are the sensible arguments called upon to crush the old dogmas proving powerless upon the way of thinking of a section of our compatriots, our comrades at work and in the party?

The most general answer to these questions can be found in K. Marx. Let us recall his profound observation that "the ideas... which capture our minds, control our convictions, and to which reason chains our conscience... are demons which man can only conquer by submitting to them."

So it is now by no means a matter of calling the dogmatists by the worst possible names, but rather of following V.I. Lenin's advice and "telling the comrades the truth in the most polite form possible." It is necessary to try to grasp the reason why, fudging themselves face-to-face with restructuring, they have failed to see the need for it or to appreciate the prospects which it has opened up.

Clearly these people are unable to correctly understand the situation. It is necessary to help them, bearing in mind that hurling abuse at them will not do here.

So it appears that the champions of restructuring have two jobs to do: not just seeking and finding the right ways to achieve an acceleration of our development, but also patiently building bridges of cooperation with those who find themselves cut off from the processes of renewal, those who are hampering restructuring.

This is not a call for compromise and bonhomie. Dogmatism may have many faces, but it is a brutal and merciless phenomenon. It is not given to flirtation; it goes for the kill at the first opportunity. That is its nature. The problem is that the nature of creative, revolutionary thinking is totally different. And we have to combat dogmatism not by the dogmatists' methods but by the methods put at our disposal by the living soul of Marxism-Leninism—dialectical materialism.

The struggle against dogmatism cannot be successful if it is not based on a clear understanding of the nature of this phenomenon, its epistemological, psychological, and social roots.

So what is dogmatism as viewed from the positions of restructuring? Above all, it is the distinguishing feature of conservative, bureaucratic thinking. It reflects the ossification of social thought, its temporary inability to move on. Dogmatism hampers development; it prevents the renewal of society.

How does this express itself? Most frequently, in the way people think today exactly in the same way as they thought yesterday and try to make life today fit in with their understanding of yesterday. That is, they operate with obsolete concepts which no longer correspond to life's new realities. Such laggard thought often appears as formally correct. However, strictly speaking, it is not so much thought as an imitation of thought.

Present-day dogmatism is the main brake on human progress. Combating it is one of mankind's key universal tasks, which confronts the capitalist and the socialist world with equal urgency. Ultimately, it is precisely the dogmatists who are threatening the world with nuclear catastrophe. And they could translate this threat into reality if they are not stopped in time.

After all, dogmatism is not merely a way of thinking; it is also a way of acting. It is a special attitude to knowledge, theory, and practice. It is a special attitude to life as a whole.

Dogmatists do not recognize dialectics, and if they do, they merely pay lipservice to it. This is why they are bound to go wrong from the outset. They divide knowledge into two halves—correct and incorrect knowledge—and they seek to retain this division once and for all. But this is precisely how they perpetuate their error.

Because even genuine knowledge turns into fiction unless it is constantly updated, taking account of changing reality. Essentially, dogmatism is a special conservative form of idealism in theory and in practice.

The phenomenon is as old as the human world itself. Dogmatism came into being as an extension of one very important quality of the human mind: the ability to retain an impression, a plaster cast of the surrounding reality, a snapshot of life, so to speak. This snapshot serves as a correct guideline for life until life changes to such an extent that a new one is needed.

This state of affairs did not present any problems for a long time, because life moved very slowly. However, history has been picking up momentum. Even people in ancient times noticed that knowledge is all too frequently outstripped by reality. Socrates was the most outstanding antidogmatist of ancient times. Is it really surprising that ultimately his fellow citizens wanted him dead? The ancients in the majority did not like those whose thought was ahead of mass consciousness either. After all, it was mass consciousness which was the most ardent devotee of dogmatism.

In the Middle Ages, it was religious dogmatism which triumphed throughout the Old World. Armor-clad fanatics spread by fire and sword arrant nonsense rammed down their throats for centuries by sanctimonious preachers. And they brutally persecuted all real thought. What havoc the Inquisition wrought! Free thinkers were hanged, quartered, and burned. But nothing could be done about their thoughts. They did not burn, and they could not be drowned.

Describing the rising theory of scientific communism, K. Marx wrote in one of his early works: "...The superiority of the new trend lies precisely in the fact that we do not try dogmatically to anticipate the future but want merely, through a critique of the old world, find a new world." And further on: "However, if anticipating the future and proclaiming ready-made solutions for all the times to come is not what we are after, we are all the more clearly aware of what we must do at present—I have in mind merciless criticism of all that exists. Merciless in two respects: This criticism does not stop short of our own conclusions and is not afraid of clashing with the powers that be."

Before the ideas of communism found their embodiment in the real socialist society, dogmatists had tried many times to emasculate them. More than once did they try to deprive these ideas of their revolutionary energy and force and their critical thrust, attempting to turn them into dead, unviable doctrines.

In Russia the "legal Marxists" and the "economists" who attached absolute importance to the role of the economy in the development of society belonged to this category.

And so did the Mensheviks, who denied the possibility of the bourgeois revolution's growing into a socialist revolution.

And so did the rightist opportunists and "left" communists who were opposed to political compromise at the time. The former and the latter were correctly described by V.I. Lenin as doctrinaires for failing to notice how "all old forms of the socialist movement were filling with new content."

In this context, V.I. Lenin wrote: "Rightist doctrinairism went wrong when it insisted on recognizing only the old forms, and it collapsed completely when it failed to notice the new content. Leftist doctrinairism insists on the unconditional rejection of certain old forms failing to notice that new content is making its way through all and sundry forms and that it is our duty as communists to master all the forms, to learn to complement one form with another with utmost speed, and to adapt our tactics to any such change..."

This is the eternal problem of dogmatism: Some of its adherents firmly favor the old, refusing to accept anything new, while others, on the contrary, rush forward without thinking, burning all bridges and discarding everything from which even yesterday they drew their strength. Lenin's appraisal helps us to gain a better understanding of the main causes of present-day socialist dogmatism which has its roots in the ideological and political struggle of the first quarter of our century. It makes it easier to understand both the dogmatism of the conservatives and the dogmatism of the avant-garde.

We must not be afraid to use the epithet "socialist" as applied to dogmatism. After all, there are very different forms of socialism. In their time, K. Marx and F. Engels were not afraid in the "Communist Party Manifesto" to level criticism at feudal, Christian, petit-bourgeois, bourgeois, and other types of reactionary socialism.

It must be borne in mind that all the socialist dogmas which distort scientific socialism, all the deviations from socialism present no danger to society as long as they remain in the realm of theory. Furthermore, they can do a good service by contributing to discussions, thus helping to elaborate socialist consciousness on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

Among the socialist dogmatists of various hues only those who wield power are truly dangerous. Why they precisely? Because they are able to translate their views into practice, thus doing violence to life itself.

A high post immediately turns a dogmatist into a most ruthless bureaucrat, prepared to wreck the ship rather than change the course which has been set.

TV Debates Show 'Pluralism of Opinions'
*PM2006113588 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA
in Russian 14 Jun 88 p 2*

[Ye. Chekalova "Television Review": "Portrait of a Rank-and-File Politician"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] A major breakthrough. At long last, pluralism of opinions can be seen on the television screen. An opportunity to speak from a union-wide platform was given to writers P. Proskurin and M. Alekseyev, historian Yu. Kukishkin, and economist Yu. Rogovin, and equal air time was allocated to writers G. Baklanov and M. Shatrov, historian Yu. Afanasyev, and economist N. Shmelev. Viewers are now given the opportunity to decide for themselves whose position appeals to them more: Whether it is N. Mikhalkov's, who easily finds a common language with foreign movie-makers, or E. Klimov's, whose movies, according to N. Mikhalkov, are not all that popular abroad. Television is even showing toleration toward cult clergymen—and one would like to believe that this is not just a temporary tribute to the current celebrations.

A free television platform is in a sense a lead-in to the all-union party conference. It is now more important than ever before to hear all points of view, ascertain all positions, and determine one's attitude toward them.

If the truth be told, it is somewhat surprising that the series "Meet the Delegates for the 19th All-Union Party Conference" proved less forceful than the writers' program "Permission To Speak" or the young people's program "Opinion." Here is some more food for thought: In terms of the serious and principled nature of his remarks and the boldness of his suggestions, current affairs writer A. Nuykin, who is not a delegate, was the most impressive of all who took part in last week's television discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses. In contrast, the other delegates seemed to be cautious about speaking bluntly, without the customary glance over their shoulders at higher offices.

During the Moscow program "Dialogue," for example, a television viewer asked a delegate about her attitude as a senior party official toward the fact that her rayon is named after Zhdanov. The answer was: This was no problem in the past, she said, but now, following the publication of Yu. Karyakin's article, new "factual material" has come to light, but even so history must be treated in a considered manner. You have to agree, however, that no matter what new factual material may now be published about the co-author of mass representations, the resolution on the journals ZVEZDA and LENINGRAD has been known since 1946, and the only question is whether Communists perceive any problem in the definition of Akhmatova as a literary "whore" and of Zoshchenko as "scum." The "considered" reply did not clarify the position.

Could it be that it all boils down to the fact that some party officials are unaccustomed to free dialogue? It was no wonder that, in the course of a television meeting with S. Osminin, first secretary of Kirov CPSU Obkom, viewers questioned him about Afghanistan and asked: Give us an answer not as an obkom first secretary but simply as an individual; not an official answer, so to speak, but a personal one.

The changing television screen is probably reflecting the changes which are gradually occurring within ourselves. Awareness is clearly being politicized today. But I also think that there is a reverse relationship: Impassioned current affairs programs could noticeably accelerate the process of our civic maturation. To the point where we all become politicians; as yet rank-and-file ones, but there is lengthy service ahead.

Letter Criticizes Proposals on Leaders' Tenure
*PM2106111588 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA
INDUSTRIYA in Russian 18 Jun 8 p 2*

[Letter from reader L. Kuzmina, scientific worker: "Restrictions Are Unnecessary"]

[Text] I would like to give my opinion about the question of restricting leaders at all levels to just two terms of office. Judging by the numerous articles in the press, the overwhelming majority of people advocate restrictions on terms of office.

Where did these proposals come from? I think that a considerable role in this is played by the widespread opinion that power corrupts people. Yes, there are many negative examples. However, this "ailment" afflicts by no means all those who are promoted to leadership posts.

I am convinced that the mooted proposals to limit terms of office constitute a willful method of resolving the issue and are in the tradition of stagnation, when people operated on the basis of formal questionnaire data rather than specific labor results.

Why should people fighting for the party line, people with high professionalism and a clear conscience, people, finally, who are just talented organizers have to leave their posts just because their time is up? If the party conference adopts this decision it is admitting that the conscience and moral qualities of Communists are in doubt.

L. Kuzmina, scientific worker. Leningrad.

Necessity of 'Cleansing' Party Discussed
*LD2006154288 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1300 GMT 17 Jun 88*

[Commentary by Vladimir Petrovich Stepanov, consultant of the House of Political Education of the Kaluga CPSU Obkom]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee Theses speak of the sociopolitical attestation of Communists as an effective means of self-cleansing and strengthening of the

party, but in my view one must approach this very cautiously. This is why: To conduct such a campaign it would be necessary to create some sort of commission, which would include present party leaders, among others. I do not wish to tar everyone with the same brush, but many of them bear the imprint of the quite recent years of stagnation. The conscience of many of them is not clean. Many have simply adorned themselves in the new coloring of restructuring. One can recall a number of cases in this connection. One rayon party first secretary forced someone else to write his dissertation for him. Another extorted gratuities from kolkhoz chairmen for his holiday. A third helped people speculate in building materials in short supply, and not without reward, of course.

These officials happen to have been found out, but how many like them are still in charge of Communists and in command of workers, kolkhoz farmers, and the intelligentsia. It is their hands that might hold the all-powerful tools of attestation. They will carry out the work as they see fit. They have no interest in the fate of the people under them. Their main concern is to remain in their posts, to hold on.

The second question is: Who is to be purged? Those who in their lives have not gone any further than indignation, who are by nature diffident and did not speak out in favor of someone; those who did not play up to the leadership or those who spoke out against it—and their number is growing very rapidly today. I do not deny that the party contains many who are there only to make up the numbers, but I fear that if we begin a purge we will lose many who are devoted to the party body and soul. These should not be regarded just as party members, they are people, first and foremost, it is their fate.

Having said all of this, the problem of cleansing our ranks remains, but it must be resolved on the basis of the present provisions and requirements of the CPSU rules. This primary and most important task can be solved only on the basis of making very strict demands on anyone joining our ranks, but it is my conviction that it cannot be carried out without a decisive and radical break with the various circulars on party admission. Otherwise, there may soon appear an instruction about admittance according to sexual traits.

I believe that the purity of the party ranks will be actively helped by regular reports by Communists, particularly leaders, to collectives of their party colleagues. This should become the permanent norm of the attestation of Communists and will be of very great benefit to the restructuring under way.

Reader Warns of Dangers of Party Autocracy
PM2006154088 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
20 Jun 88 Second Edition p 1

[Letter from T. Dzerve under the rubric "Discussion Platform" and the general heading "We Discuss the CPSU Central Committee Theses": "On the Basis of My Own Experience"]

[Text] I passed through a great and terrible school of life, including 17 years in a strict-regime camp (from January 1938 through July 1955). I was in party and Komsomol

work in V.I. Lenin's lifetime. The work was very difficult at that time. But party organizations did not suffer the diktat of one individual: You could go and see any leader, talk freely about everything, and if necessary, argue.

Within the framework of the discussion of the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the all-union party conference, I, too, would like to share my thoughts. The first thing I consider it necessary to say is that we must exclude the possibility of autocracy becoming established in the part. The first step leading to autocracy is the personal inaccessibility of the leader, and the second is prolonged periods when the party apparatus is not replaced.

How was it in the twenties, in V.I. Lenin's time? At that time, the bureaus of primary party organizations came up for reelection every 6 months, and raykoms, annually. There was justification for these reelection terms: A significant number of Communists passed through the educational school of the first level of party work; moreover, those who were elected were not removed from their workplaces. If they were voted out, they could peacefully return to their former jobs, because they had not lost their production experience.

And another proposal: At present a party organization, having received notification from investigative organs that criminal proceedings have been instituted against a Communist, immediately starts personal proceedings to expel him from the party, without waiting for the outcome of the investigation and trial. I think the party organization has a right to decide this matter only after the decision of the court. I worked for a very long time on the party commission of Sokolnicheskiy CPSU Raykom, and I know that unfortunately, even today, slander is not such a rare phenomenon. It can happen that purely on the basis of an investigator's report, a Communist is expelled from the party. Many times it has happened that after the trial, when the charge is dropped, he is restored to the ranks of the CPSU.

T. Dzerve,

CPSU member since 1920. Moscow.

Self-Criticism From General Secretary Urged
PM1906165588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
18 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by Yuriy Orlik, IZVESTIYA deputy letters editor, under the rubric "Mailbag": "I Want To Help My Party"]

[Excerpts] A letter under the above headline and the subhead "Ordinary Communist's Notes on the Speech by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee" was published in IZVESTIYA in mid-May (No 132). Its writer—Captain 2d Rank Valeriy Yelkin, who currently works as senior engineer at the Estonian SSR

Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education—tried to seek “clear and direct answers to the innermost questions which give us no peace.” The main question being—how can an ordinary party member really influence party affairs? How can we believe that restructuring is irreversible when our souls bear the scars of past disappointments: “At 13 I found out just what Stalin was, then at 24 I found out about Khrushchev, and at 42 about Brezhnev. . .” How, ultimately, are we to ensure that “the party never has to blush before future generations, as I blush now looking at my children who grew up during the years of ‘stagnation’ and ask: ‘Where were you, a Communist, during all this time?’”

There were hundreds of letters in response to this article. [passage omitted]

The mailbag—for all its different opinions—contains the clear idea that restructuring is our only salvation. “We are not Stalin’s ‘cogs.’ Each individual contains a whole world of experience,” 80-year-old Candidate of Historical Sciences G. Chuchmay from Krasnodar states. “This truth has cost us dearly. It is now the cornerstone of restructuring.” “To abandon restructuring would be to lead the country to destruction,” A. Petrovich from Kaliningrad believes. The same is stated by schoolmistress I. Molodyan from Kishinev: “We are alarmed, no, not alarmed, simply tormented by the thought that if all the efforts of Gorbachev and his supporters are in vain, then there will be a real collapse.”

Virtually every letter is an appeal to the 19th all-union party conference. “On the eve of the conference our society has been veritably stirred up,” senior engineer I. Belyakov writes from Kazan. “Its decisions are being awaited with unprecedented interest and impatience. People are expecting a long-overdue reorganization of party organs and a demarcation of their functions and those of state organs. They are expecting that party ranks will be cleansed and the high moral standing of party member will be restored. They are expecting serious guarantees that new cults will no longer be permitted. They are expecting a time when the areas open to criticism will extend to the Central Committee Politburo and the general secretary. They are expecting the most courageous self-criticism from him. The conference must and cannot fail to answer the questions that are tormenting not just V. Yelkin.”

And finally. “The very fact that V. Yelkin—like probably thousands of other doubters—believes in restructuring and has gotten himself out of the ‘rut’ says a lot,” A. Chetverikov from Yalta believes. “This means that the 3 years of struggle for society’s renewal are bearing fruit.” The same idea—that we must not be observers or critics on the sidelines but must help restructuring and the party through our actions—is voiced in many other letters. “We must be together with the party rather than alongside it,” T. Mikhaylov from Ust-Kamenogorsk writes.

Agricultural

Early Jun Weather, Crop Condition Reported
PM2006142188 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN
in Russian 15 Jun 88 p 1

[Agrometeorologist T. Rossinskaya report: “The Weather and the Crops”]

[Text] Hot dry weather prevailed in the past 10-day period in the eastern half of the country’s European territory. For most of the time the maximum air temperature was 33-38 degrees. The mean air temperature was 5-8 degrees above the perennial mean here. The weather was moderately warm in the western half and there was frequent rain, which was especially heavy in the western oblasts of the Ukraine and in parts of Belorussia and Krasnodar Kray.

In most of the European territory of the USSR winter grain crops have formed ears and flowered and the stalks of spring barley have continued to grow. Winter grain crops in the south of Moldavia and the Ukraine, in the North Caucasus, and on the Lower Volga have reached the milky ripeness stage and spring barley has begun to form ears. Grain crop development is 8-15 days ahead of mean perennial times and 12-20 days ahead of last year’s times.

Over most of the grain corn cultivation zone conditions for growth of vegetation are good—7-9 leaves have formed and early-sown crops have 11 leaves. Heavy rains with hail fell in the western oblasts of the Ukraine, in parts of Moldavia, and in certain western rayons of Stavropol Kray; they damaged plants and in places crops can be observed to have been washed away.

Potatoes are in flower in the south of the Ukraine, the North Caucasus, and in the Transcaucasus while on the rest of the territory lateral shoots are continuing to grow on potatoes and the formation of inflorescences can be observed on early crops. This is 7-14 days earlier than the mean perennial times. The conditions were for the most part favorable for plant growth and the commencement of the formation of potato tubers.

Hot weather in the RSFSR and the Baltic area accelerated the development of flax. Stems continued to grow everywhere and early-sown crops in Latvia, Estonia, Pskov Oblast, in the west of Smolensk and the south of Gorkiy Oblasts have begun to form inflorescences 20-25 days ahead of the mean perennial times. The plants are 8-20 cm high. There is 80-100 mm of productive moisture in a 50 cm layer of soil. Inflorescences have formed on the flax in the Ukraine and Belorussia.

Intensive dry winds with a daily temperature of up to 32-35 degrees and in places up to 38 degrees in the Volga Region, the eastern half of the Central and Central Chernozem Regions, in the south of the Ural and Volga-Vyatka Regions were recorded for 5-9 days and soil

moisture was increasingly exhausted. Vegetable crops needed additional irrigation. In the last few days the heat has abated and conditions for the growth and development of agricultural crops have improved.

Unstable weather was recorded in the crop-farming regions of Siberia. The mean air temperature was near to the perennial. Winter crops have completed the growth of stalks and have formed ears in most of Tyumen and Omsk Oblasts, Altay Kray, and in the south of Novosibirsk Oblast. The height of the winter rye at the ear formation stage was 55-80 cm. Early spring grain crops have rooted and stalks are growing in Uralsk and Akt'yubinsk Oblasts and in the southeast of East Kazakhstan Oblast. Hot and primarily dry weather—with some dry winds—recorded in most of the northern and western oblasts of Kazakhstan, in Tyumen Oblast and the southwest of Omsk Oblast has helped the intensive evaporation of moisture from the upper soil strata.

Leaf formation has begun on corn in the south of West Siberia and in the northern oblasts of Kazakhstan, shoots have appeared on late-sown crops, and the state of the crops is good. Shoots have also appeared on early potato crops. Cereal grasses have begun to form ears, pulses have begun to form inflorescences, and stalks have continued to grow in the more northerly regions. Conditions for the growth of grasses were also favorable in the Far East. The formation of inflorescences has been observed in the south of Maritime Kray on pulses and cereal grasses have begun to form ears. The state of the plants is good.

Unstable weather in the Central Asian republics and in the south of Kazakhstan, with torrential rains in some regions, was accompanied by stronger winds and was not favorable for the development of cotton. The development of plants is lagging 3-5 days behind mean perennial times. Cotton crops have been partially flattened by torrential flooding in Namangan Oblast.

Budding has begun on cotton in the Moscow area and flowering has been observed in the extreme southern regions. The alfalfa here has begun to form a third growth. It is primarily in a good state.

Regions Should Be Able To Supply Own Food

PM2106100188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian

14 Jun 88 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "The Food Counter. Poor Use Is Being Made of Local Resources in Supplying the Consumer With Products"]

[Text] Among the many important problems, the food problem is a paramount one. This was mentioned again at the recent CPSU Central Committee plenum and USSR Supreme Soviet session. To be frank, we are not exactly weighed down with products. Although rations as

a whole are near normal, there are shortages of many important types of foodstuffs. Hence the lines, and sometimes coupons and enforced "sausage" trips to big cities.

What is the problem? After all, the agro-industrial complex is not standing still; and there has been a marked increase in production. But this movement is taking place from a level that we regarded as unsatisfactory. Agriculture is not operating at the required pace yet. The mighty potential established in the agro-industrial complex is not having the desired impact. It is true, though, that the measures adopted in recent years have increased per capita consumption of meat, milk, and other products. But it is still obviously not enough. That is why the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, in discussing this matter, described the state of affairs in relation to food supplies for the population in some parts of the country as intolerable.

Some, because in many republics, krays, and oblasts a substantial increase in food production has been achieved. Local food supplies have markedly improved in Belorussia, Latvia, the Altay, Belgorod, Lipetsk, and Orel, and a number of oblasts in Kazakhstan and the Ukraine. Is it possible, then, by making skillful use of available resources, to meet people's needs? Both by increasing field and livestock unit output and by developing subsidiary plots. There is a very good reason now to achieve an increase: Once deliveries have been made to union republic stocks, products are left at the disposal of krays and oblasts. Some are making full use of this opportunity, but others are hankering after their neighbors' bread.

There are still many republics and oblasts where supplies are not too good. In Moldavia, Buryatia, and Astrakhan, Kurgan, Amur, and Vologda Oblasts per capita consumption of the main products has, in fact, fallen rather than increased. There has been a reduction in milk purchases in Armenia and Tajikistan. The references to bad weather do not sound at all convincing. The lackadaisical, parasitical attitude of local party, soviet, and economic bodies is the main reason. Often they try to solve the food program at the center's expense, without adopting the requisite measures themselves. There are regions where they consume 50-100 percent more milk and meat than they produce.

But experience shows that self-sufficiency is a realistic objective for practically all regions. In Azerbaijan, Turkmenia, and Maritime and Khabarovsk Krays are there really insuperable obstacles preventing them from satisfying meat requirements out of their own resources? And what dire necessity is it that makes the leaders of Bashkiria and Kalinin and Kirov Oblasts scrape together "cabbage" stocks? The fact that in Bryansk, Voronezh, and Kurgan oblasts they have been forced to bring in onions from outside, does it mean they have stopped growing them on local truck farms? All this could be produced successfully everywhere.

The food question must be solved as quickly as possible. All the prerequisites exist in the country to accomplish this. It is important to develop and support the initiative and enterprise of collectives and of all working people who have recognized the situation and have gotten down to the job with a sense of great responsibility. Economically accountable contract teams and links everywhere have demonstrated what enormous reserves the agro-industrial complex possesses for increasing agricultural production. It is evident today that the lease contract is the quickest route to food sufficiency. When they are allowed to, lease contractors use land, livestock units, and equipment sensibly and effectively. Obstacles, prejudices, and formalism—all this inhibits the development of the progressive form of management.

The form in which the product reaches the consumer is also of considerable importance. If it works more efficiently and more enterprisingly, the processing industry can considerably increase food resources. It has been slow to organize waste-free technology. Often allied enterprises produce very different quantities of products from one tonne of raw materials. The meat processing growth rate is lagging behind the meat production growth rate. Targets for producing meat-based convenience foods and canned meat are frequently not met. Cheese is scarce in a number of places, although some places are making poor use of their capacities. Through the fault of the confectioners, fruit candy is in short supply. Few low-sugar pastries, cakes, and baked goods are being produced. And what a meager range of canned fruit and vegetables there is! The inefficiency of processing industry workers is the only explanation for the major gaps.

Farmsteads have not yet fully revealed their potential. Many rural families do not keep livestock. Problems with the acquisition of young animals and feed are a factor, of course. But they are not that insuperable if local leaders do not let things slide. After all, in Omsk Oblast they managed to achieve a situation where a considerable proportion of the meat and milk being consumed was produced on personal plots. Procurement and cooperative workers are often indifferent toward attempts by "private operators" to sell surplus products. Industrial enterprises' subsidiary plots are outcasts in the agro-industrial complex. Many agricultural units at plants and factories have to operate on a plot the size of a pocket handkerchief, but no land gets allocated to them. Least of all resources.

Local initiative in building up food resources needs assistance and support from central departments. The USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee, the USSR Ministries of Grain Products, the Fish Industry, and Trade, Tsentrsoyuz, and union republics' Councils of Ministers have been extremely slow to restructure work in that area. Poor interdepartmental liaison, a predilection for heavy-handed management methods and, on occasions,

petty tutelage have not yet been eradicated. Obsolete instructions inhibiting the enterprise and initiative of farmers and procurement and processing workers are in vogue.

Agro-industrial complex bodies are the most passive of all. Many rayon agro-industrial associations are not bothered at all about improving local supplies. In fact, the incentive is sometimes lacking. As a rule, the oblast "seizes" all above-plan products and distributes them at its discretion. The tax-in-kind principle often does not operate at the farm and rayon level. Attempts by kolkhozes and sovkhozes to decide what happens to above-target products are cut out by zealous administrators. Command methods are still in vogue among many agro-industrial associations, and not everywhere have economic levers of production management been brought into play.

No rural Communist has the right to adopt a neutral attitude to the state of affairs in food stores. Party bodies must carry out a careful, comprehensive study of the potential of every farm, rayon, city, oblast, and republic and actively contribute to improving supplies of all types of products for the population. The people judge restructuring by how successfully the most crucial problems are being tackled. This basic principle should also be followed by rural party organizations, demanding that Communists participate effectively in the socioeconomic transformation of the country's agro-industrial complex.

All the conditions have been established for a resolute breakthrough in the countryside today. What will our diet be like tomorrow? This depends on everyone currently working in field and livestock unit.

Scientific

Reportage on 'Mir' Cosmonauts, Space Experiments

Cosmonauts Receive Awards

LD1706230088 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1830 GMT 17 Jun 88

[Text] The Soviet-Bulgarian space crew which completed its joint flight today has been rewarded with the highest awards of People's Bulgaria. By a decree of the republic's State Council, Solovyev, Savinykh, and Aleksandrov have been given the title "Hero of the People's Republic of Bulgaria" and invested with a gold star and the Order of Georgi Dimitrov. These awards have been conferred on the cosmonauts for successfully fulfilling the "Shipka-88" scientific-technical friendship. Soviet Cosmonauts Titov and Manarov, who are continuing their flight on board the Mir orbital complex, have each been awarded the Order of Georgi Dimitrov.

New Crystals, Compounds Noted

*LD1706171588 Moscow World Service in English
1500 GMT 17 Jun 88*

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] In the view of experts, this latest international crew carried out the biggest program of research as compared to any of the previous ones executed by mixed crews on Soviet orbital stations. The international crew brought back to earth photographs of Bulgarian territory and coastal areas of the Black Sea which are needed for more profound research into Bulgaria's natural resources and for shaping its ecological policy.

Space-based furnaces have yielded new types of crystals, compounds of rubidium, silver, and iodine for electrical engineering, along with alloys of tungsten, aluminum, and copper.

The men also conducted astrophysical observations and medical, biological, and a number of other experiments. The research program made extensive use of Bulgarian-made computer equipment and other hardware.

The Bulgarian leader Todor Zhivkov greeted the men on the successful completion of their flight.

Bogodyazh on Cosmonauts

*LD1906191688 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1212 GMT 19 Jun 88*

[Text] Baykonur Cosmodrome, 19 Jun (TASS)—Special TASS correspondent Nikolay Zheleznov reports:

The scientists and specialists from many countries who have prepared the equipment for studies of Mars and its satellite met today at the Baykonur hotel with the journalists reporting on the Soviet-Bulgarian "Shipka" project. The unique pieces of scientific equipment that are to be sent to Mars on 7 and 13 July are already on board the stations. The preparations for the launchings are going strictly according to schedule.

In their turn the journalists reporting on the Soviet-Bulgarian expedition were also asked questions. French engineers in particular were interested to learn which Bulgarian equipment had remained in operation on the "Mir" space station and how the members of the crew of the main expedition are feeling after 6 months of work.

Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov are feeling very well, came the reply. The Bulgarian equipment was essentially only tested during the 7 days that the expedition was at work during its visit and is now starting to go into regular operation. It will, incidentally, be partially used during the Soviet-French expedition in December this year.

Will Titov and Manarov still have to work for a long time yet? Replying to this question put by French experts, a participant in this unusual "Shipka"- "Phobos" briefing, a representative of USSR Glavkosmos, S. Bogodyazh, said that the crew did not have a formal task to beat the record of Yuriy Romanenko (326 days). Doctors believe, nonetheless, that if the cosmonauts work in orbit for 12-13 months it will bring world science qualitatively new information. Therefore, as long as the orbital complex is operating normally, we are reckoning, S. Bogodyazh stated, that our new "space long-livers" Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov, will receive the Soviet-French expedition on board the "Mir" station in December.

Supernova Observations Cited

*LD1906203788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0400 GMT 19 Jun 88*

[Text] Today is a working day on board the scientific-research station Mir. Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov will carry out work with the Bulgarian Rozhen astrophysical equipment. Within the framework of the Roentgen international research program into extra-atmospheric astronomy, five series of observations of a supernova star in the Great Magellanic cloud are planned. We shall remind you that last year the telescopes set up on the Kvant module recorded for the first time the powerful X-radiation from the flaring star. The new information that will be obtained during the coming experiments will provide an opportunity to trace the evolution of this unique heavenly body.

More on Experiments

*LD2006132788 Moscow TASS in English 1311 GMT
20 Jun 88*

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—It will be half a year tomorrow since Soviet Cosmonauts Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov have been working in near-space orbit. Over that time the crew have carried out a big complex of nature exploration, technological, medical-biological and astrophysical experiments.

The ten-day Soviet-Bulgarian outer space experiment ended the other day. During the international expedition Titov and Manarov did a double job: they worked among the international crew and under their flight program. The tasks set have been successfully fulfilled.

Of indisputable interest to science are the observations carried out by the cosmonauts of the new X-ray star, which flared up in the Vulpecula galaxy. The telescopes of the orbital observatory "Roentgen" registered a harsh radio spectrum corresponding to a temperature of nearly a million degrees. It is for the first time that such a temperature has been registered for the stars of this class in the practices of astrophysical explorations.

The series of bio-technological experiments done in "Ainur" and "Ruchei" (brook) equipment is also important. The former is designed for obtaining in weightlessness monocrystals of protein preparations, the second is used for the electrophoretic purification of gene-engineering interferon. The cosmonauts have carried out in the "Svetoblok-T" equipment a series of experiments for the synthesis of polyacrylmide gel necessary for the perfection of the technology of obtaining on earth biologically active compounds. Work has been started for a further study of the dynamics of growth and development of higher plants in conditions of outer space flight. The objects of investigations were seeds of wheat and cultured tissue of arabidopsis.

The Soviet Union has accumulated vast experience of holding long-duration expeditions in orbital complexes. Suffice it to recall that Soviet Cosmonaut Yuriy Romanenko worked in "Mir" for 326 days, nobody has ever spent so much time off the earth ever. It has been calculated that over the years of the space era all the cosmonauts of the earth spent a total of nearly 17 years (in man-day count). The Soviet cosmonauts account for 12 years of that time, and the American cosmonauts—for a little more than five years.

Research Vessel Concludes Antarctic Voyage
*LD1806135488 Moscow TASS in English 1144 GMT
18 Jun 88*

[Text] Leningrad June 18 TASS—The Soviet research expeditionary vessel "Akademik Fedorov" has completed its first Antarctic voyage and returned to Leningrad today. The voyage continued for almost eight months throughout the periods of South Polar spring and autumn which are notable for most complex ice and weather conditions.

The vessel circumnavigated the ice continent, visiting all Soviet research stations. The ship logged about 50,000 miles—more than 4,500 miles navigating amid ice, and 20,000 miles navigating the waters of the southern ocean and its seas abounding in icebergs.

Giving these data, the ship's captain Mikhail Mikhailov has emphasised in an interview with a TASS correspondent that the voyage fully confirmed the calculations of the builder of the ship, the Finnish firm "Rauma Repola". The vessel is expected to become the leading one in a series of Soviet vessels for polar research and for the supply of Antarctic stations.

At the end of summer the "Akademik Fedorov" will go to the Finnish Rauma Telakka shipyards for warranty repairs and in October the vessel is to make a new voyage to Antarctica.

Vorotnikov Presents RSFSR Science Prizes
*LD1806013688 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 17 Jun 88*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] Diplomas and badges of honor of RSFSR state prizewinners in the field of science and technology were awarded for the first time in Moscow today. Congratulating the winners, Vitaliy Ivanovich Vorotnikov noted that the republic's State Prizes Committee had made awards to six projects of world standard. [passage omitted]

Leaders Sign Academician Naumov's Obituary
*PM2006135188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Jun 88 Second Edition p 6*

[Obituary of Academician Boris Nikolayevich Naumov]

[Excerpts] Soviet science has suffered a grievous loss. Academician Boris Nikolayevich Naumov, a major Soviet scientist in the field of control theory, computer equipment, and information science, a CPSU member, director general of the USSR Academy of Sciences "Personalnyye EVM" [personal computers] Intersectoral Scientific and Technical Complex, and director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute for the Problems of Information Technology, died 11 June 1988 at the age of 60.

B.N. Naumov was born 10 July 1927 in Moscow. On graduating from the Moscow Power Engineering Institute in 1950 he worked at the USSR Academy of Sciences Control Problems Institute. At this institute he carried out important research on the theory of automated systems. From 1967 through 1983 he headed the USSR Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems Institute of Electronic Control Machines. B.N. Naumov became director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute for the Problems of Information Technology in 1983. [passage omitted]

V.I. Vorotnikov, L.N. Zaykov, Ye.K. Ligachev, A.N. Yakovlev, O.D. Baklanov, I.S. Belousov, I.S. Silayev, B.L. Tolstykh, G.I. Marchuk, O.S. Belyakov, A.I. Volskiy, V.A. Grigoryev, N.V. Gorshkov, V.G. Kolesnikov, V.I. Shimko, M.S. Shkabardnya, G.A. Yagodin, Ye.P. Velikhov, V.V. Ryabov, I.M. Makarov, K.A. Valiyev, A.A. Voronov, A.A. Dorodnitsyn, N.N. Yevtikhiyev, S.V. Yemelyanov, A.Yu. Ishlinskiy, V.A. Melnikov, V.S. Mikhalevich, V.S. Pugachev, A.A. Samarskiy, V.S. Semenikhin, A.N. Tikhonov, G.G. Ryabov, V.V. Przhiyalkovskiy, N.L. Prokhorov, V.M. Kubrin.

Briefs

New Tadzhik Academy President

At an annual general meeting of the Tadzhik Academy of Science on 6 May, M.S. Asimov asked to be released from his duties as academy president. The Academy

granted his request and elected S. Kh. Negmatullayev, director of the Institute of Seismic Resistant Construction and Seismology and a Tadzhik Academy of Sciences academician, president. [Summary] [LD2405005288 Dushanbe *KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA* in Russian 7 May 88 p 1]

End